

Swami Sahajanand Saraswati

A Biographical Study

Raghav Sharan Sharma
Aditya



CONTENT

<i>Preface</i>	7
1. Birth and Childhood	19
2. Sanyas	22
3. Shastra Manthan	26
4. Social Work	28
5. Entry into Politics	33
6. Experiences of Jail	43
7. Backdrop of Peasant Revolution	55
8. Kisan Halchal	71
10. Tide of Peasant Revolution	82
11. Peasant Council and Indian Politics	153
12. Swamiji's Literature	163
13. Differences with Political Parties	212
14. Background of Ramgarh congress	224
15. Ramgarh Session Against Compromise	229
16. Partition	267
17. The Agrarian Condition of Society	274
18. Formation of the Bihar Provincial Kisan Sabha	279
19. Character of the Movement	283
20. Ideological Position of C.S.P and A.I.K.S.	286
21. Organization and Method	290

6 | *Swami Sahajanand Saraswati*

22. National Politics and Decline of the Bihar Kisan Sabha: Walter Hauser	292
23. Arvind Narayana Das on Sahajanand: Agrarian Unrest Myth of Champaran Satyagrah	298
24. Kisan Sabha and United Left Front	306
25. Myron Weiner on Sahajanand	311
26. Shiv Sagar Sharma on Sahajanand	316
27. Evaluation of Swami Sahajanand Saraswati	318
28. Sahajanand: Today, Tomorrow and Beyond	325

PREFACE

Stratification is the basic organizational feature of societies. Differentiation precedes stratification and then accompanies it. The rewards of the society are distributed unequally and the inequality is instilled in the social structure. Thus inequitous society comes into existence. In that context the attitude of oppressed class may find expression, which exactly happened when peasants of India as a product of historical necessity organised themselves under the able, selfless and tireless leadership of Swami Sahjanand and grew from strength to strength. The circumstances of those days warranted the emergence of All India Kisan Sabha, which was supported whole heartedly by one of the greatest revolutionary leaders of all times, Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose who believed that peasants must be organized in country side; this was imperative since it was in the country side that recruitment for the British Indian Army took place. Soldiers belonged to peasant families, many of them children of Kisans. If class consciousness of Kisans was awakened, then under the impact of mass uprising, the soldiers would be also revolt in unison, culminating in freedom from British empire and establishment of Kisan Mazdoor Raj. Subhas wanted Swaraj for the masses, Swaraj for the workers and the peasants. Subhas and Swamiji were complementary,

* State power would be vested in the hands of peasants and working class. This would mean liberation of populace from exploitation, oppression and discrimination. This would also mean the creation of equitable society through capture of political power by the exploited. This inherently meant Kisan Majdoor Raj.

8 | *Swami Sahajanand Saraswati*

and supplementary to each other. Both were men of action. They were anti-thesis to Gandhi-Nehru's maneuvering. While Swami ji was ideologue, formulator and militant activist of kisan movement and impending revolution, Subhas, a stalwart amongst nationalists had great faith in Swami ji. As Subhas announced on 5th July 1943 at the military review of the Indian National Army:

"I must remind you that in a non violent guerrilla campaign the peasantry always plays a decisive part. I earnestly hope that Swami Sahajanand Saraswati will now lead the campaign to a victorious conclusion. I will appeal to Swami Sahajanand and the leaders of the kisan movement to come forward and fulfill their leading role in the last phase of the fight. Let your slogan be "Now or Never", "victory or death", "Inquilab Zindabad":

When Swamiji was arrested on 19 April 1940 on the charge of sedition, Subhas Chandra Bose wrote in "Forward Bloc" on 20 April 1940 in his capacity of Editor:

"Swami Sahajanand Saraswati is in this land of ours, a name to conjure with, the undisputed leader of the peasant movement in India, he is today the idol of the masses and the hero of millions. It was indeed a rare fortune to get him as the chairman of the Reception Committee of All India Anti Compromise Conference at Ramgadh. For the Forward Block it was a privilege and an honour to get him as one of the foremost leader of the Left movement and as a friend, philosopher and guide of the Forward Block itself. We congratulate Swami ji on the signal honour - he has won through his arrest and incarceration. Swami ji's arrest is to

* "To Delhi, To Delhi—S. C. Bose, The Nationalist and the Commander"; Vinitha Ramchandani (2015), Hachette, UK.

be welcomed. It will inspire millions to break the stalemate and take the plunge. One can no longer continue sitting on the fence. The time for action has come and we must act. Swami ji has disappeared behind the bars but he has left behind a legacy. We have to learn the lesson from his life struggle, the lesson of service and sacrifice, the sound political instinct of radicalism and dynamic socialism. He is essentially a man of action and when arrested, he appealed to the countryman not to delay and procrastinate but to act at once. Swami ji's arrest is nothing less than a challenge to new India. That challenge we have now to take up. Let this British government see and note that the country stands socially behind him. There can be little doubt today that if there had been no Forward Block and no Kisan Sabha, no voice would have been raised against the policy and the line of action persuaded by the Gandhiaites during the last twelve months." (pg 1014, *India's War of Independence: Through Kisan Documents*, Raghav Sharan Sharma (2014), Manohar Publication)

Forward Bloc and Kisan Sabha led by Subhas and Sahjanand respectively became a point of panic and phobia more and more as it turned into a platform of real Left* and an epicentre of uncompromising struggle. Agrarian Revolution had actually begun and peasants had taken the initiative of seizing lands from Zamindars and driving them out of villages, of taking possession of large holdings. Thus even while the pre-requisite stage of Indian Revolution had reached its end; instead of preparing and working to usher in the next stage, Congress

* In Ramgarh Anti Compromise Session held on 19th March, 1940, Subhas remarked that those are reluctant to fight imperialism are anything but socialists; rather they are psuedo socialists. Real Left, accordingly, comprises of people who are *anti-imperialists to the teeth and ready to fight all kinds of exploitation without surrendering to any sort of compromise.*

10 | *Swami Sahajanand Saraswati*

• Socialist Party (CSP) and Communist Party of India (CPI) deserted Left Consolidation Committee (formed to ensure the completion of impending Indian revolution) and amazingly surrendered to pseudo-progressives of Congress and betrayed the cause of revolution. They ditched the Left Consolidation Committee in favor of compromise. Meanwhile, Congress expelled Swami ji for six years and Subhas for three years on the frivolous charge of indiscipline in year 1939.

Vallabh Bhai Patel wrote to Rajendra Prasad on 15th July 1939:

“I do not know, what you propose to do about Swami Sahajanand? He has made no secret of his intention to defy and has actually done so. How can you ignore such conduct? Provincial Congress Committee should deal with Swami Sahajanand Saraswati with regard to his speeches and writing in support of this Satyagrah. I do not know, what you propose to do about Subhas? I do not know, why Rahul has again been released? This does not reflect any credit on our administration. We must act now a little more firmly”. (*India’s War of Independence through Kisan Documents*, Raghav Sharan Sharma (2014), Manohar Prakashan, New Delhi)

At a more fundamental level Swami ji never reconciled to the idea of peasant playing a second fiddle to ‘proletarian’ or ‘nationalist’ movement. He wanted the true and complete liberation of peasants and not the suzerainty of any particular party. Accordingly he wanted an independent class organization of peasants, not subservient to any political party. As a result that both Communists and Gandhites disliked the assertion of peasantry and its leader Swami Sahajanand. His advocacy of the autonomy of peasant politics, brought him in conflict with Gandhi-Patel-Nehru group of Congress and separation from Communists and resulted in his closeness with Subhas.

Swami ji was chairman of Reception Committee of Anti Compromise Conference held at Ramgarh in 1940, which was presided over by Subhas. He was acknowledged leader of United Kisan Sabha in 1948 and president of United Socialist Organization of Indias since Feb. 21 1950 which comprised of 18 different left groups, barring C.P.I and C.S.P, whose main constituent was Forward Bloc established by Subhash Chandra Bose. Both Subhas and Sahjanand had steadfast allegiance to peasants' cause which ultimately led to their expulsion from the Congress in 1939. This was followed by parting of ways from Congress Socialist Party in 1941 and with Communist Party of India in 1945. Both Subhas and Sahjanand were committed to revolution in Indian way, in Indian tradition under Indian conditions - the undiluted liberation of the downtrodden and the escalation of respect to folk culture and Indic civilization. War of Independence achieved only partial success on 15th August 1947 as the Congress accepted dominion status, instead of total and complete independence. Indian people were denied the right to constitute and elect their Constituent Assembly on the basis of universal adult franchise. Selected few were allowed to enter the Constituent Assembly on basis of restricted franchise. Head of state also remained unchanged. The country was partitioned. The hated system of colonial period remained intact. So, it was freedom for a few who belonged to ruling class. *It was not the freedom as had been desired by Sahajanand, Chandra Shekhar Azad, Birsa Munda, Sido Santhal, Bhima Nayak, Tatya Tope and Subhas Chandra Bose. The folk culture was relegated to a secondary subordinate position and frowned upon in the elite Anglophone ruling classes.*

Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose's Indian National Army and Swami Sahajanand's Kisan Sabha together created mass uprising and patriotism amongst the common populace which culminated in deep rooted hatred against the Empire. Devoid

of any action programme, the 'Do or Die' call given by Gandhiji at Gowalia Tank Maidan ended abruptly in few months in 1942 itself; but call given by Netaji to disobey British rulers, was heard and soldiers began to rebel against order of their British masters. The Indian Naval force went on mutiny, which is famously known as Royal Indian Naval Mutiny of 1946. It was welcomed by Indian masses including the peasantry. This brought the war of independence to its logical end. The Navy was the back bone of the British power. This Naval mutiny inspired the Army, the Airforce and colonial Police to become insubordinate. The Empire found itself sitting on volcano. The British government saw the writing on the wall and on the advice of Field Marshal Auchinleck, they decided to quit as early as possible. Therefore, it was because of sacrifice and bravery of Netaji and militant movement of peasantry, which had been given an organizational shape by Sahajanand, that the British decided to quit. Ironically and unfortunately, we are asked to believe that few foreign educated lawyers got us independence.

Peasant movement was helpful in this endeavour in the sense that it educated and involved the rural masses amongst whom the foot soldiers of British Indian Army were recruited. Azad Hind Fauz members were present in India and were facing trials as prisoners-of-war which caused great sensation and excitement in general public. Now, Indian Army was induced and inspired by Netaji's sacrifice. It remained no longer disciplined and reliable for the Empire. British understood that it would be impossible to rule such an awakend India. British were fearful about their lives and safety of their capital. So, they called on second line of their defence, the Nehru-Gandhi-Jinnah combine to take over the charge through transfer of power. They were fearful of capture of power by oppressed masses and rebellious Army. We may well understand the British anxiety if we place in context the suspicion of Communist

takeover throughout the world.

V.M.Kulkarni wrote in “The Otherside” in his article “Historic Naval Mutiny 1946” that the mutiny proved to be the last nail in the coffins of the British Empire. In an incident he narrated, Mr Atlee was staying at the Calcutta Raj Bhavan during his visit in 1956. He was speaking to P.B. Chakrawarthi, the Chief Justice of Calcutta High Court, who was acting as the Governor of West Bengal at that time. Mr. Chakrawarthi asked Mr. Atlee (*PM. of Britain in 1947*): “Why, even after winning world war second, did England decide to leave India?” Mr. Atlee replied:

“It was because of fear of Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose that we left India. He created an almost impossible situation for us.”

Colonial regime's dependence for '*state monopoly of violence*' was primarily on the armed forces and Subhas Chandra Bose destroyed that edifice of an instrument through which they could subjugate Indian people. They were compelled to leave. Once disobedience started, it created fear amongst British officers.

Chakrawarthi further asked what was the effect of the Gandhi-Nehru combine and congress influence on their leaving?

Mr. Atlee said: “Minimal”

This clearly shows that history has to be written afresh. Sahajanand Saraswati refused to let the past of All India Kisan Sabha become just a piece of obsolete history. The undisputed leader of the peasantry, Swami Sahajanand Saraswati traversed a long distance before he rallied for the causes of peasants, downtrodden and marginalized. He started his work from social reform movements and got involved in Indian National Congress starting from Bihar and finally got associated with nationwide movements. He was soon disillusioned with Gandhiji's

ambiguity, vagueness and dilatory stand on the question of have nots. He soon became disgusted with petty, comfort seeking hypocrisy of Armed chair Gandhiaites, which he critiqued nonchalantly in his autobiography. He consistently viewed Gandhiji *...as a wily politician, who in order to defend the propertied classes, took recourse to pseudo spiritualism, professions of nonviolence and religious hocus pocus, a dictator in the garb of democracy."*

As a peasant leader by standards of speech, actions, theorisation, formulations, directions, he was unsurpassed and supreme. He could communicate with peasants and articulate their feelings, speak for them. He was a militant agitator. He sought to expose the precarious condition of agrarian society and to organise the peasants en masse to achieve change. He did this through countless meetings, rallies, enormous land grabbings, Importantly he spoke the language of peasants. Using vernacular idioms interlaced with grammar of insouciance rural rhetoric, he used to ask "How will you collect rent while our lathis are powerful?" "कैसे लोगे मालगुजारी, लट्ठ हमारा जिंदाबाद।" This became the war cry of peasantry.

He said:

"I do not want my individual salvation while those who are destitutes remain shackled and unliberated in this material world. I will stay with them, live with them and die with them. Bread is far more important than God."
(मेरा जीवन संघर्ष (My Life Struggle), Swami Sahajanand Saraswati)

Gandhiji had repeatedly demanded:

"The Kisan movement must be confined to the improvement

* This can be inferred from various places in the Complete Works of Swami Sahajanand Saraswati published from Prakashan Sansthan, New Delhi as 'Swami Sahajanand Saraswati Rachnavali' (Hindi), (Edited by Raghav Sharan Sharma).

of the status of kisans and the betterment of the relations between the Zaminders and them."

As opposed to this Gandhian line, Sahajanand refused to confine the movement. He was actually preparing it for seizure and capture of power through mass uprising supported by people's militia as is clear from his '*Charter of Demands of Kisan Sabha*' (1949).

Sahajanand remarked:

"It is they (lowest strata of the peasantry) the semi proletariat as the agricultural laboures who have very little land or no land at all and the pety cultivaters who any how squeeze a most meagre living out of the land, they cultivate and eke out their existence, who are the kisans of our thinking and who make and must constitute the Kisan Sabha ultimately." (महारुद्र का महाताण्डव - The Devastating Dance of the Maharudra, Swami Sahajanand Saraswati)

It is to be noted that it was Swamiji and Subhas who actually started the "Quit India Movement" in 1940 in which Gandhiaites joined late in 1942. Sahajanand along with Subhasaites and Kisan Sabhaites were sent to jail in 1940 itself.

Gandhiji traced the reason for Indian subjugation in its moral decadence. He identified Gita as the most suitable Hindu scripture. For Gandhiji non-violent religion reigned supreme. It was second to none, not to the nation, not even to the people. He did not contradict Varnashram or Zamindari. This way did not align with any challenge against prevailing economic, social and religious system. Sahajanand had a diametrically opposite world view and class interest. Sahajanand was anti thesis of Gandhiji and his policy, ideology and formulations and way of execution.

Swami Sahajanand reshaped Vedanta and made it active

and logical. Previously it was only for *pravachan* and *shastrartha* (preaching and exegesis). He also reshaped Marx in Indian way and moulded Marxism in Indian tradition. His interpretation were denied by both diehard Marxist and orthodox Vedantists. Swami Sahajanand Saraswati too wrote a commentary on the Gita. But, the way Gandhiji and Swami Sahajanand read and interpreted the Gita provides us with a clue to their different approaches to political action and social emancipation along with the basic religiosity of their language of politics.

Gandhi's *swaraj* praxis, seen from the prism of class struggle, leads to attainment of political freedom to Zamindars, Propertied and Big Capital while Sahajanand sought to eradicate the exploitation of kisan and mazadoor by zamindar, imperialists, colonialists and capitalists and wanted to establish Kisan Majdoor Raj. Sahajanand wanted fundamental, total, complete and radical change which would lead to socio-economic restructuring, while Gandhi simply wanted to mend the system. Their views of the world were poles apart. Sahajanand identified the most populous segment of society, the peasantry, as the basis of main motivating force over colonial forces which was decisively propped by Zamindars. Sahajanand wanted to over throw British, Zamindars and Mahajans in one stroke. Gandhi was limited to political freedom from external rule as such as not to sever relation with the empire, that is status of Dominion but not of a 'sovereign'.

Gandhi got what he wanted on 15 August 1947, but goal of Sahajanad is still unachieved . He was the leader of war against exploiters, colonialists, Britishers and their Indian collaborators like zamindars and other exploiters. He was also the leader of war of liberation too for the exploited. Gandhi and Sahajanand were poles apart in their vision, perspective and action plan. Meaning of *swaraj* for them were entirely different and opposite.

It is unfortunate that Swami Sahajanand Saraswati and his associates like Yadunandan Sharma, Indulal Yagnik, Nakashatra Malakar and others have yet to get their due from history despite the efforts of Walter Hauser, Arvind Narayan Das, Vinod Mishra, Kuber Nath Roy, Sunil Sen, Rakesh Gupta, Hanigham, Shiv Sagar Sharma, Shri Ram Sharma, Ashok Kumar, Shyam Narayan Roy, Raj Kishor, Sudhakar ji, Ram Chandra Sharma and others. Sahajanand has been largely forgotten. It is necessary to review the evolution of fascinating personality of Swami Sahajanand Saraswati to correct the historical misappropriation of history of peasant struggle, their contribution in war of Independence and their aspiration for war of liberation. Sahajanand's literature is helpful in understanding the oppressive agrarian society in colonial India. No other text is as elaborative as his conceptual formulation to explain the intricacies of agrarian class struggle in the most pragmatic and practical way. It also elaborates the status, role and place of the peasants in any radical change in a primarily agrarian society.

He clearly emphasized the role of theology in mass mobilization and peasant uprising. In all aspects, he was unique mass leader. It is no more surprise that Swamiji and his legacy is being ignored. However his role and contribution still resonates in peasant and people's movement all over India.

He was expelled from his community. He was suppressed by Zamindars and Purohits of his caste as a disruptive force to their hegemony. The Vedantic sects were dead against his practical and pragmatic approach of theology. His approach towards Vedant antagonized orthodox and traditional Vedantists as they felt aggrieved by his progressive views accommodating Marxist ideology. Similarly, orthodox dogmatic Marxists were antagonized by Swami ji view of Marxism, which incorporates nationalism and traditional Indian folk culture.

His emphasis on mass organization also antagonized C.P.I. Swamiji refused to dance to the tune of Communist Party of India and opposed their line which was Pro-Gandhi, Pro Partition and Pro British. The C.P.I. was working under the dictates of Communist Party of England and Soviet Union. It had no programme of its own till 1951. Although Swamiji was Marxist of unorthodox variety, he had independent view point.

The political party, Congress, with which Swamiji was initially associated, was led by landlords, elites and big business. Conflict of class and political interest between existing leadership and Swamiji resulted in his expulsion from party. It is not surprise why he was ignored by all section of political and intellectual elite who were contemporary congress socialist party also toed the Nehru line and through Nehru they came near to Gandhi and his political line. This was the paradox. Swamiji's unrelenting stand on his belief in the class interest of peasants and uncompromising stand on non-dilution of his belief made him unique saint, peasant revolutionary and warrior of independence, always uncompromising and unparallel and of substance. The war is on.

“My soul, sit thou a patient looker on;
 Judge not the play before play is done:
 Her plot hath many changes; everyday
 Speaks a new scene; the last act crowns the play”.

Raghav Sharan Sharma
 N-9-31-C2, Brij Enclave Colony
 (Sunderpur) P.O. Bazardiha
 Varanasi (U.P.)
 Mobile : 8400024455

BIRTH AND CHILDHOOD

Swami Sahajanand Saraswati was born in village 'Deva'. This place is located near Dulhapur railway station in Gazipur district of Uttar Pradesh. His ancestors settled there from Bundelkhand in Madhya Pradesh and were from 'Jujhauitiya Brahman' Gotra. Jujhauitiya Brahmans are in large numbers in Hamirpur, Lalitpur and Jhansi areas of Uttar Pradesh. This area has often been referred as "Jajak Bhukti". As per historians, Jujhauitiya were settled in Punjab as "Yaudhey" during the period of Alexander's invasion. During the course of struggle with Alexander, they moved to Malwa region. Being struggle loving in nature they are called 'Jujhauitiya' which means struggler. After settling in Deva in Saiyadpur in Gazipur district in Uttar Pradesh and being separated from relatives, Jhauitiya started following food habits and matrimonial ceremonies similar to the 'Bhumihar Brahmans' which were somewhat similar to their's original clan.

Swamiji's family was from a peasant's background. After division of ancestral property, their financial situation dwindled and as a result they were left with no other option but farming. This socio-economic status of Swamiji is the key towards understanding his political belief and social actions. Being from a middle peasant family coupled with utter poverty, lack of farming tools and labourers, deprived of means of production, probably kept on motivating him to work towards betterment of the section.

As an unparallel revolutionary, he was credited with successfully managing the first organized peasant revolution across the country. Swamiji's stature and lifelong struggle can

provide an insight into his working style and thoughtfulness.

He was born on the day of Mahashivratri in 1889. He was named Navrang Rai. His father was Beni Rai. He passed out upper primary in 1902 securing 95 per cent marks. He would have scored 100 per cent if the remaining 5 per cent questions were not out of scope of prescribed books. Examination was of 20 marks. He secured 19 marks. To appear in the exam, he had to travel 20-25 miles. It was commented by Dy. Superintendent of examinations: "*If this boy would have appeared in a scholarship examination then he would have surely secured it.*" His sharp mind and studious nature, he remained cynosure of all eyes in school. His memory power was so immaculate that he memorised the entire epic of *Ramayana* in childhood itself.

At the age of 12, his *Upnayan Sanskara* was conducted. Since then he became regular in his evening prayers. Other than this, he was proficient in conducting *Shivapooja* in the proper traditional manner. His primary teacher was regular in chanting *Shiv Mahimnah Strotra* of *Pushpadant Acharya*. These things influenced his early stages of his life. Swamiji remained a rigorous follower of Vedic methods and *Geetadharm* throughout his life. On the other hand, since childhood he had observed cunning acts and false practices by greedy preachers. This induced in him a dislike towards preaching without commensurate action. This dislike became further stronger in future peasant revolutions and struggles.

He completed his studies through the prescribed traditional methods of priests alongwith continuing his evening prayers. In the same course he developed a flare for yoga and asceticism. This flare ultimately induced him to leave his homely affairs and direct him towards attainment of God by becoming a *Yogi*. Continuing on this, he started learning Sanskrit which ultimately resulted in Swamiji becoming a great Vaidik scholar. His struggle directed him towards being a part of the peasant struggle instead

of being engaged only in evaluation of *Shastras*. All his efforts became directed towards betterment of the peasant society. All through his life he remained away from useless philosophical altercations instead continuing his struggle for oppressed and exploited and for Kisan Mazdoor Raj.

In 1904, he passed his middle level exams. He secured 7th rank across the province. He secured scholarship. He took admission into German Mission School in Gazipur. In 1906 while pursuing class IX he felt attracted towards Sanyasa. However teachers were of opinion that this child shall secure first position across the province in matriculate exams, next year. But future was pulling him in some other direction. In summer of 1906 he left for Haridwar to become a Sanyasi, but returned from Kakori. He thought that it would be better to search for a Guru before becoming sanyasi.

Navrang got married in Maidhiya village near Sadat railway station in Gazipur district. His wife died in the winters of 1906. In Jan.-feb. of 1907 arrangement were being made for his second marriage. Navrang was already motherless. He reached Apaamruth Math near Dhundiraj Ganesh in Kashi in feb. 1907 before the night of Mahashivratri. Thus the first chapter of Navrang's life ended at the attainment of age of eighteenth year. Securing first rank in university was missed by bits.

Shakespeare's has written in the play "As you like it" :

All the world is a stage.

And all the men and women merely players.

They have their exit and their entrances.

And one man in his time plays many parts.

The Swamiji's role of childhood and the whining school boy with his satchel on his back, completes. In the next part he was prepared for becoming a *Sanyasi*.

SANYAS

Apaarnath Math of Kashi is related to Dashnami organization. Dashnamis have Sanyasis with vsuborder names which are ten in total. Of these, Teerth, Ashram and Saraswati are entitled to hold a '*dand*' or a ceremonial stick. Due to prevailing traditions only Brahmins were entitled to become a '*dandi*'. Remaining Bharti, Puri, Aranya, Giri, Parvat, Vana and Sagar were not entitled to get *dand*. People of other castes were found in these seven. *Dandi* sanyasis have a ceremonial bamboo stick in their hands. prepared through secret sacred process. An axe shaped cloth is tied on the upper part. It is tied through a strange kind of thread. On the lower portion a white thread is tied in such a manner that it creates an image or position. *Dand* remains with sanyasi in his hand while awake and is hung in a special manner when asleep.

Navrang was burning with desire for taking vows of *brahmacharya*. He had a principle of neither giving up nor returning (न दैन्यम् न पलायनम्). Since his mother was already dead, he considered himself free from all responsibilities and accountabilities. He was eager like a true yogi towards attainment of God. He undertook the vows of *brahmacharya* under Swami Achutyanad Giri of Apaarnath Math. He was named Swami Sahajanad. His paternal aunt, who took his care since his childhood died in sorrow hearing that he had become a sanyasi. Subsequently, his father also deceased. Swamiji was firm on his decision. He was firm on keeping himself away from sorrows of family. His mind, thoughts and actions were in

73747

a sync which was also source of his incredible energy. He kept a constant vigil on his logic and faith which was reflected in his working. Synchronization amidst his heart, mind, words and actions enabled him to perform the tasks. This sync was the source for his dedication and efficiency throughout his life. Swamiji became sanyasi with sole motive of attainment of God. Naturally this flare forced him to live in jungle.

At that time he kept himself away from worldly activities concentrating on yoga, exercises, dhyaan, Vedanta. He continued to study Geeta. However his understanding was that being involved in worldly affairs diverts a person from sanyas. At that time he considered even the biggest philanthropic act as a pity worldly act. However, this understanding totally changed after developing a deeper understanding of Geeta. Those days Swamiji was engaged in search of God like a madman.

Swamiji reached Prayag from Benaras via Jhansi. During his journey he remained hungry for about 52 hours. He almost gained a control over his hunger. He reached Chitrakoot via Shankargarh and Karvi. There he saw Mandakini river and Kamad Hills mentioned in the Tulsidas Ramayana. In Anusuya, he observed the lust for money in the eyes of sadhus and facing adverse consequences in the same course. Continuing on his journey he visited Rajapur, birthplace of Tulsidas.

An interesting incident took place during this journey. Once while suffering from high fever, he was caught in a heavy downpour. He found a recluse in an old Shiva Temple. As soon as he got engrossed in *Dhyana*, his body temperature returned to normal. This was an unprecedented experience in the life of Swamiji. Probably fever got down due to his firm belief. It is not easy to evaluate this incident but such incidents have always happened in the lives of great people in India.

Swamiji moved on from Kanpur with intention to see Narmada and Omkareshwar. He reached the bank of Narmada

via Lalitpur and Bina. He stopped at Mane village in Narsinghpur district. There he met an intuitive and true vedantic person, referred colloquially as 'Vedantiji'. Vedantiji observed four types of donations—donating to poor and sadhus, free medicines, donating books and scriptures and ensuring fair justice being the honorary magistrate. Swamiji praised all these four forms of donations. In true sense Swamiji's Vedanta was not fully complete and comprehensive till the time it was not into the practice, it not part of life. Lifestyle of Vedantiji person was truly vedantic and enforceable. Swamiji was influenced by his devotion to work which further pulled him towards the path of social action. Swamiji attained the state of being in true *Karmyogi* and realizing the true Vedanta after ten years of wandering and searching.

Swamiji faced utter disappointment in search of a true Yogi in Omkareshwar. He met crooks in the name of yogis. This was the first major blow. However he did not lose hope. He reached Ujjain via Indore and visited Mahakal Jyotirlinga, one of the twelve Jyotirlingas. Swamiji used to have meal only once in a day. He then proceeded to the King of Rajkot where he satisfied the King by expounding the 18th sloka of the fourth chapter of Geeta. He received adulations there. Deewan's mother asked him to make disciple of her. Due to this he escaped to Mathura, as he disliked *Gurudom*. He was in Soro on the day of Mahashivratri from where he reached Haridwar via Bijnour. He stayed at Yoganand Math in Hrishikesh. At Kailash Math, he studied and learned 'Siddhanth Muktawali' from a learned Vedantic scholar. He also observed the down fall in the actions of sadhus. However he kept on roaming in jungles in search of a yogi which he failed to find. He then turned to Badrinath. He reached Kedarnath via Devprayag, Rudraprayag, Triyuginarayan, Gaurikund and Bheemgoda. Then he reached Badrinath via Unkhimath and Joshimath. Within a span of

one year, Swamiji covered a huge distance on foot but his desire to meet a yogi and attainment of God remained unfulfilled. He reached Bharauli near Buxar via Kashi and Kotwa where he stayed on the request of Mahant Shivprasad Giri. Though Mahant he was a sanyasi, he used to extort money from poor farmers and labours. Swamiji decided to move away from there. He decided to pursue Sanskrit literature at Kashi. He writes "After exploring jungles and mountains, searching yogis and roaming around, I have not gained anything. God is still too far. So let us study the scriptures and see what do they have".

Swamiji reached Kashi ji in 1909 and stayed at Apaarmath and started studying sastras.

Gyan Yoga became the next part of his illustrious life. His each stage was associated with certain different characteristics. In each stage he was fearless, stern, duty bound, devoted, dedicated, daring, decisive, transparent, considerate, logical, rational, uncompromising, responsible, serious, farsighted, practical, controlled and mature. He was always same in his *man, vachan, karm*; Synchronization and equilibrium amongst his heart mind, words, deeds, actions and commitments enabled him to perform and fulfill the task he had chosen for himself in each stage. This remained clue to his success in each stage, in each role he played. Now, it was the turn of *Gyan Yoga* in his life.

SHASTRA MANTHAN

Staying at Apaarmath, he started reading *Siddhanth Kaumudi* under famous scholar Harinarayan Tripathi. In mid-1911 he completed reading the difficult and troublesome *Kaumudi*. *Siddhanth Kaumudi*, which normally takes 6-12 years as a serious study, was completed by Swamiji in 2-2.5 years. Simultaneously, he started studying other *darshans* (schools of philosophy) as well. In the beginning, he used to eat in *kshetra* but later he adopted '*madhukari vritti*'. After moving to *Foote-Ganesh* locality his meals started being arranged in the homes for selected Brahmins. Collecting meals from different houses is called '*madhukari vritti*'. His primary studies took place in Apaarnath Math but later he moved to *Tedhi Neem* locality. In 1911 he undertook *dand* through *Dandi Swami Advaitanand* and his full name was changed to Swami Sahajanand Saraswati. He used to eat at Sarai Govardhan and used to visit Sonarpura for studying *Nyay*. He learned *Nyay* from Shankar Bhattacharya and Jeevnath Mishra in Kashi and Pt. Balkrishna Mishra in Darbhanga. In literature he also pursued *Shishu-Pal-Vadh*, *Kirat Arjuna* and *Naishadh*. Famous scholars from Kashi namely Pt. Gangadhar Shastri and Pt. Shivkumar Shastri were also his teachers. Swamiji dedicated himself in studies of such scriptures.

Study of *Nyay* and other books confirmed vision of vedanta of world being an illusion. Reading *khandan-khand-khadya* and *Padartha-khadya*, left a stunning impression on his personality. He never thought of becoming a scholar and earning money

and opening study centres. He always thought that if building study centre was the aim then why have I left my home? Have I taken birth for serving kings and rich people?

Swamiji also studied books from Ayurveda and Astrology. He wrote a book named *Karmkalap* after studying 'Smart' scriptures and *Karmkand*. Famous Vedic scholar Prabhudutt Brahmachari used to praise this book. Swamiji studied *Meemansa* under Pt. Chitradhar Mishra in 1915 in Mithila.

Swamiji gained knowledge about various subjects from many well-known scholars of his era. Names of four scholars need to be mentioned : Pt. Harinarayan Tiwari in grammar, Pt. Shankar Bhattacharya, Jeevnath Mishra and Balkrishna Mishra in *Nyay*. Swamiji could have visited any place for gaining knowledge. In seven years, he became proficient in Sanskrit through his rigorous studies.

He was soon recognized as a great scholar of *Vedant*, *Nyay* and *Mimansa* in Kashi. This indeed was the important stage of his life. Now, it was turn of next stage, social work in which he was drawn unconsciously and naturally, as if in a process. Swamiji wrote a book on content and intent of Geeta named *Geeta Hriday* and *Mimansa Darshan*. *Geeta Hriday* is unique treatise on Geeta as it discussed, examined and formulated Marx, Advait Vedant and Geeta Dharm. It bridged the gap in between Gyan and Karma, in between Marx and Geeta. Although Swamiji was scholar on *Nyay*, he could not get time to write on *Nyay*. He also could not complete *Geeta Hriday* which was planned to be written in three parts, but only two could be completed. *Geeta Hriday* reveals intent of content of Geeta. It is a treatise on Advait Vedant and Sanyas. It establishes that *Lok Sangaraha*, service to toiling working masses is the duty of Sanyasi and is the essence of Geeta Dharam.

SOCIAL WORK

Swamiji took part in Balia Session of “Bhumihar Brahmin” meet organized in December 1914, when he was asked to speak, he praised German scholar Maxmuller in his speech. Germany and England were at war at that time. Naming a German was considered a crime. Since he was not part of politics he was unaware of this clause. During his speech he was reminded through a chit sent to him by organizers to abstain from praising a German. People loyal to the rulers who were also incharge of such meetings could not tolerate such praises. This was the first instance when Swamiji’s mind was shaken by the politics. Swamiji evaluated both forms of Brahmins: one who begs and one who does not and praised the one who does not, thereby raising their confidence. This led to rise the self-confidence of Bhumihar Brahmins and a wave of social awareness and reform rose through them. By 1927, Swamiji understood that landlords formed organisations and clubs on the basis of castes and took government in confidence to get their work done. This was not in best interest of social development. Swamiji understood that Zamindar as a class are social base for imperialism.

Swamiji gained two experiences from Balia session. Firstly that these caste organisations were just congregation of kings and riches and they were loyal to the government by nature itself and they pursued their personal interest by remaining loyal to government and getting their work done. They did not care about their social responsibilities. Secondly those Brahmins who were not begging, have developed a sense of fear and

inferiority within themselves resulting in pride and confidence amongst Brahmins who were involved in begging and priest hood. Quoting references from fourth chapter of "Manusmriti" and shlokas from "Shanti Parv" of Mahabharata, he commented precisely on various points related to Brahmins. Explaining the verses from scriptures, he elaborated on how farming was better than being a priest and thus breaking the illusion of many, who considered being priest was being superior. He smashed the inferiority complex of peasant Brahmins and invoked a sense of self-confidence amongst them. In the same go he also took aim at the monopoly of the priests and opened various schools thus making non-begging Brahmins scholars. By writing simple and detailed books such as "Karmkalap" he showed non-begging Brahmins a practical path to pursue. Swamiji quoted references from history, proved his statements through his three books: "Bhumihar Brahmin Parichay", "Brahmin Samaj ki Sthiti" and "Jhutha Bhaya and Mithya Abhimaan". "Brahmin Samaj Ki Sthiti" was first published in 1911. Famous editor of *Saraswati* Magazine evaluated it in his magazine in this manner: "This book has been written after proper research and hard work. Book has not missed out any point". This book was later published as "Brahmrshi Vansh Vistar" and it elaborated the topics related to Tyagi, Gaalav, Chitpawan and Mohiyal all non-begging Brahmins. Swamiji has written about this:

This has been illusion that the Brahmins around are of superior mind set-because of being from begging. Two types of non-begging Brahmins taking up other activities and beggar Brahmin remaining in begging, both of these are personal beliefs of Brahmins. Yes, Begging in crisis is correct. However, this depend on the personal thinking, not on any predefined rules whether a non-begging Brahmin should work as a priest or not". Here begging has been used for purohit Brahmin and non-begging for Kisan Brahmin.

Around 1916, under the leadership of Swami Sahajanand Brahmins undertook a revolution to oppose the pre-defined basis of family based monopoly rights to be a priest. Swamiji injected a sense of pride amongst the sub sections of Brahmins, opposing the sense of superiority-inferiority. This lead to the recognition of Galav, Chitpawan, Bhumihar, Babhan, Mohiyal, Tyagi and Juhhauaitiyas and they strongly pursued the sense of being equal amongst the Brahmin society. Meetings of sub-sects such as Kanyakubjya and Saryuparaniya supported the logic as correct and justified. Scholars such as Rahul Sanskratayan, Suniti Kumar Chaterjee*, Dr. Hajari Prasad Dwivedi and Baldev Upadhyay also published write up in favour of Swamiji. Brahmin Pt. Yadunandan Sharma and Yagnik became a devotee of Swamiji and remained alongside him through out his life. In this way the expansion of historic journal of Brahmins 'Brahmshri Vansh' lead to a new evolution and destroyed the sense of superiority amongst the priests and inferiority amongst the others sections of Brahmins. Becoming priest and studying Sanskrit became after word an easy task .

Earlier Swamiji was amongst the persons who spend their entire life in solitude, who cared only about their personal liberation and not about the society. However, after observing the Shastras in an open manner, his vision underwent a basic change. Now, he switched from perception of liberation of individual to liberation of society, service to toiling masses.

There is a shloka in Bhagawat Puran wherein devotee Prahlad answers Lord Narshimha—"Serving people is equivalent to serving and praying the Lord". This enlightened Swamiji. This Sloka continues "Sadhu and sages spend their life in solitude for sake of their own liberation, they don't care about others. However, I cannot do so. I don't want liberation when

* Suniti Kumar Chaterjee was scholar on language and Hazari Prasad Dwivedi was scholar of Hindi and Rahul was a polymath and social activist.

others are still suffering. I would live and die with these people. Same was supported in the conversation of Jad Bharat and Rahugan, "Performing your duties efficiently is a form of praying the supreme".

Geeta has announced it many times "Service of lord is not in praying but is in truly performing your duties". The meaning of God is "Go On Duty".

In the ninth chapter of Geeta, 27th sloka states that—"Do anything, eat, drink, donate, perform yagyas- all are equivalent to worshiping God if these are performed with faith and without any self-interest; instead it should be in the fine interest of society".

Geeta has proclaimed that "society oriented action and working for welfare of the society is the supreme act—if it is performed without the sense of profit-loss, success-failure, and fame or glory".

The inner struggle within Swamiji was now settled to a large extent. His thoughts changed and he decided to devote his time towards social work. This happened in the end of 1915. Abandoning the exercises, samadhi and flairs he decided to pursue analysis of Shastras; however circumstances forced him into philanthropy, social work and social action. Swamiji's nature was not to abandon any work incomplete, thus, when he got involved in the philanthropy, he devoted all his energy into it. The question was not only related to caste and evaluation of Shastras but now he wanted to be free from the boundaries of caste and was attracted towards working for the whole society. This later made him the foremost person in the freedom struggle which was providing the propelling force to the peasants. By initiating the task of raising a whole section of a society, he transformed it into the struggle for the whole nation. This became more clear to Swamiji at a later stage. He was drawn to national struggle gradually but vigorously. This became another stage in

his life struggle.

“Preparing a person who has been snatched of his rights is the freedom struggle and a true service for me. Raising the society in the true sense is the social work and philanthropy in my view”.

Swamiji now was focusing on the whole nation instead of being concerned only about a Brahmin section. Now, his plan perception and orientation changed drastically. Gita was dear to him and it became a path finder for him in future through out his life. He rewrote the language of politics in colonial India and unearthed Gita'a a true meaning for the impending struggle against colonialisms and feudalism, which was both grounded in tradition as well as relevant for the day.

Now, it was the entry of sixth stage and role in his coming life as one of foremost leader of war of Independence struggle in Colonial India. Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak became role model in this endeavour in initial stage who used to say that "*Swarajya* is our birth right". Swamiji was greatly influenced and inspired by selfless service, sacrifice and nationalism of Lokmanya Tilak. A certain amount of antagonism between Hindus and Muslims existed in the country. The colonial power cleverly exploited it during its reign. Sagacious leaders like Lokmanya Tilak had started attempts to secure the participation of Muslims in the nationalist struggle under what came to be known as the Lucknow Pact. Tilak, Madam Besant and Jinnah evolved a formula under which the Muslims would get representation greater than what would be justified on the basis of the percentage of muslim population. Both Tilak and Jinnah were frank and bold. But when after the demise of Tilak, Gandhi came on the political stage, he through his cleverous politics alienated Jinnah and Muslim from national Politics. Inevitably the division of the country came into being .

ENTRY INTO POLITICS

By the end of 1916 Swamiji started living in Vishambharpur a village of Gazipur district. Living there for two and half years he performed many philanthropic works over there. He realized that the work done amongst the common people was performed quickly and in a better manner. However the opposite of this was true for wealthy persons. In 1918 he started living in Kotwa Narayanpur near Buxar. There he continued with his works of education, spreading vedantic awareness and social Revolutions. Hindi journal *Pratap* was available there. Swamiji read about the death of Tilak in the same. This news troubled him. Tilak was the first propagator of "Independence is my birth right". He was a social activist. He inspired people to participate in the freedom struggle by initiating the Ganesh celebration and Shivaji celebrations and by publishing books such as "Geeta Rahasya." He was a political spearhead and a popular figure amongst the Nationalists. He was dedicated, fearless and fiery. These lines were published under his photograph:

Spent times in fighting
 Dedicated the life for it
 How the death has came
 Why not his death met his end.

Tilak was culturally rooted and Dayanandi brand of native nationalist where as Gandhi-Nehru were of Raja Ram Mohan Roy* cult and anglicized elites. Both groups has different world.

* Raja Ram Mohan Roy was anglicized social reformer of early nineteenth Century.

view. Subhas and Swamiji were Tilakites in background.

Swamiji started hearing about various parties ever since 1916. He also read the speech of Congress President Majumdar in 1916. News of Mahasabha used to reach him. He started reading Hindi journal *Patliputra* and English journal *Express*. Swamiji was not aware of the politics but fast changing circumstances were making an impact on him which were pulling him towards politics. Whole country was anxious about the revolution started by Tilak and now the command of Tilak-Gokhale tradition was in the hands of Gandhiji, who unlike Tilak was not fiery but was expert in catching the aspirations of the mass. Swamiji was unable to keep himself away from these and knowingly-unknowingly was attracted and drawn towards it. Going through these social changes and ample ways he finally ended up on the path of farmer-labour struggle. Death of Tilak worked as an inspiration for him for sacrifice on the altar of Indian Nation. No doubt, Gandhi caught the aspirations of the masses but had no action plans for relief of peasants and labours. Contrarily Gandhi had the blessings of contemporary ruling dispensation of rulers and Zamindars. Gandhi sought to prescript and constrict the glorious legacy of Tilak to suit his own preconceived predilections. Sahajanand and Subhash were later on, for their dissent, expelled from Congress in 1939 by Gandhi and Nehruites jointly. It was not the clash of personalities but of different world view, different class interest. Zamindars were not averse to Empire and their supporters. They were themselves stem of British Raj. Gandhi was their chosen favourite.

APPEARANCE IN POLITICS

Swamiji participated in the Non-Cooperation Movement in 1920. He thought that only through national struggle and mass movement his own struggle shall be successful, which was but a part of larger whole. He attended the Nagpur and Ahmedabad

sessions of Congress meets. The draft for Non-Co-operation movement, actually started by Tilak, was passed in Nagpur. This was opposed by Jinnah, C.R. Das and Vijay Raghavacharya etc. Jinnah subsequently formed a separate Organization named *All India Liberal Federation*. He also said that after the passage of proposal of Non-Co-operation, there was no scope left for people like him in Congress. He disliked introduction of mass movement and entry of orthodox Maulanas in national politics such as Shaukat Ali, Muhammad Ali etc.

Swamiji writes about this "This was the first instance when the largest political party of the country turned towards those silent exploited farmers and labourers without whose inclusion in the politics, it was not possible that the struggle would be massive and government would agree." Non-Co-operation was in line with the basic nature of Swamiji. He was totally against the concept of sustenance by begging. Strength of Congress became massive by being directed towards the common people. Inclusion of common people pulled Congress out of politics of appeal, making it a power capable of forcing the govt to concede and bend.

In 1920, Swamiji participated in the Non-Cooperation movement with his full strength, but he found that there were many rich, wealthy people who were opportunist and who changed their sides when government adopted demolishing and crushing measures. Few others saw their leadership in trouble with the upsurge and rise in people sentiments. They were of the view that politics is only for educated people, what has farmers and labours got to do in it? They cleverly raised the question of rural vs. urban and pushed farmers and labours towards back end. Villages were under the influence of landlords. Thus when it came to villages, the landlords were not affected by this tactic while inclusion of farmers would have made this negative. This hurt Swamiji a lot. Zamindars were

averse to farmers. Exclusion of farmers and inclusion of village instead, suited the Zamindars who had powerful grip on villages through touts. So, they supported Gandhi in their class interest.

Maulana Muhamad Ali along with Shankaracharya of Puri, Bharti Krishnateerth were sent to jail for participating in Khilafat Movement. According to Swamiji. "This was fortunate for the country that a Hindu religious-leader has been jailed for the rights of Muslims."

People who were actively involved in burning of foreign made clothes were dubbed as being involved in violence by the rich and wealthy. Swamiji felt sorry for the fear amongst the urban middle class due to stagnant sentiments in the ever changing world. However his illusion was not broken fully till now. He was still operating within the lines prescribed by Gandhiji but his heart eager. Swamiji was not able to fully understand the changes in the leadership. The situation was still in his sight. During his participation in the Non-Cooperation and Khilafat movements, Swamiji realised that barring few leaders like Maulana Azad and Dr. M. N. Ansari other Muslim leaders were getting involved in the activities of League. Swamiji wrote a letter to Gandhiji in English as a suggestion:

Though you are an experienced and wise person, then why you faced betrayal. You told me on 5th December 1920 that people like Maulana Muhammad Ali would not betray. These people are cheating us. All of them are now involved in the League. My fear has proved out to be true.

When Khilafat movement was taken back in 1922 by Gandhi, Maulanas became involved in religious conversion which was called *Tabligh movement* and in retaliation Arya Samaj started purification drive called '*shudhi-karan*'. This tussle resulted in Hindu-Muslim riots frequently. Riots were a by-product of Khilafat Movement.

Postponement of 1920 Khilafat Movement in 1922 proved to be defeat for movement - making the defeat excruciating and humiliating for both congress and Gandhi. Patronization of self styled and often regressive section of Muslim leadership of Maulanas by Gandhi was opposed by nationalist and secular muslims led by Jinnah. Gandhi's articulation, manoeuvering tactics and occasionally declaring quotas for various groups was resented. Gandhi was not exculpated or freed from fault for his divisive and religious politics.

Many a congressmen were communalist under their national outlook. The Hindu Mahasabha was formally founded in 1921 in opposition to the Gandhi's policy of appeasement to maulanas and on communal issue. Lala Lajpat Rai* wrote a series of articles in 1924 for the *Tribune*, then of Lahore. He wrote "Mahatma Gandhi's personality is to a creation extent a puzzle. He sometimes seems to be supporting narrow mindedness even superstitions, sectarianism in some of its aspects. This has brought about a reaction and has given a new life to those pandits and Maulbis who before his advent were fast losing influence among their communities. The result is sectarians have become more bigoted than they were ever before". He further wrote:

Non-cooperation which was for the idea of Hindu-Muslim unity thus became one of the forces favouring disunity. Shastras and shariats have been studied and requisitioned only to create an atmosphere of narrowness in any bigotry.

Col. James E. Dillard described it as "The failure of Nehru's Mass contacts campaign and the use of Muslim separatism" in Journal of South Asian and Middle Eastern Studies Vol. XXXI, No. 2, Winter 2008, pages 65-66.

Lajpat Rai further wrote in 1924:

* Lala Lajpat Rai was associate of militant leader Tilak. He was also President of Congress and Hindu Mahasabha both.

"The Last four years by the way have brought into existence a legion of Maulanas, Pandits and Gyanis whom no one had ever credited with any sanctity or prestige."

Lala Lajpat Rai's and Swami Sahajanand's observation about Gandhi and Khilafat Movement reflects intellectual honesty, freedom from prejudices and a certain openness. After Khilafat most liked leader Gandhi finished a miserable lost horizon.

Gandhiji applied his lawyer instinct and replied to a complex in a simple manner: "I do not repent my estimate of Mommadans." This hurt a lot to Swamiji. His question was not about Muslims but about the actions of Maulanas and their leaders, who changed to communal politics after withdrawl of Khilafat movement.

Swamiji went through a similar experience at the Brahmapur Animal Fest. He saw that now-a-days the religion is just for the namesake and show. Big question of protecting Cow was a fraud. There were temple purohits and landlords in the fest, who were standing in the favour of butchers, reason being increase in their earnings. Materialism and Spiritualism had a heated altercation over there and spiritualism was bashed badly. Large Lord of Materialism bashed small lord of spiritualism.

Gandhiji never considered religion separate from politics. And the state of religion was such that it had made people opportunist, killing the sense of hard-work, initiative taking and dedication. Religion became a tool of showbiz. Swamiji was at the verge of being released from such sentiments, however being a regular reader of Gandhiji's Magazine 'Young India' these sentiments could not be eradicated to the fullest. Yes, there were some changes but they were mental only. Questions were: Real or Fake Vedant, religion of celebration or religion of sustainence and support, propagating the old age religion or serving the society. Questions were substantial but Swamiji was still in the exploratory phase.

His thoughts were not so strong. There was a new struggle undergoing within him, later he realised: Religion was not a common for all, it was individualistic in nature. Religion and politics should be kept separate. He learnt from his experience.

The truth is that Swamiji was not so experienced about the outer world till now. Over the time when he gained this experience then he went on to look the new meaning of Geeta, which he explained by penning down *Geeta Hridya*. This book has suggested that philanthropy and welfare of toiling masses is the essence of Vedanta.

In 1922, Gandhiji suspended the Non-Co-operation struggle and called for the meeting of All India Congress Committee in Delhi. He wanted that the Congress party should aim at 'legitimate' meaning 'truthful' and 'peaceful' meaning 'non-violent'. All India Congress Committee never clearly accepted the aim of words truth and non-violence desired by Gandhiji. Swamiji also participated in the 1924 Ahmedabad session of All India Congress Committee meeting. C.R. Das* praised the motives of revolutionary Gopinath Saha and presented a proposal, which was supported by Motilal Nehru etc. However the proposal could not be passed. Gandhiji unwillingly re-presented the proposal and got it passed and thus death sentence of Saha was cancelled. However, this was not repeated in case of death sentence awarded to Bhagat Singh. Gandhi-Irwin agreement and Karachi Session of 1931 were concluded during the same time. Reformist were against such beliefs of Bhagat Singh.

Gandhiji had an agreement with Das in the special session of congress held in Delhi and it was agreed that congressmen

* C.R. Das was leader of Swarajya Party. He denoted heavy amount to congress and was selfless. Although he was moderate, he supported Subhas and other revolutionaries. He was nationalist and selfless. He opposed Gandhi at Gaya Session of Congress.

can enter the councils but not in the name of Congress Party but in the name of Swaraj Party. Swamiji was also a part of rigid group of no-changers over there which was led by C. Rajagopalachari and the liberals were led by C.R. Das. Gandhiji wanted that the proposal of appealing against the government order of taking over the property of Gangadhar Rao Deshpande be passed in the Ahmedabad session. However congressmen disliked the invidious case and thus Gandhiji's proposal was rejected with majority.

It is crucial to understand the First World War which was global and the biggest contribution was from India to Empire by its loyal subjects. The Empire's biggest contribution was from India and Gandhi. This included 37 lacs tonnes of supplies, over 10,000 nurbis, 1,70,000 animals, 1460 lacs of Indian revenue and political support that of Gandhi, who recruited Indian volunteers in the face of nationalist opposition. India provided 11 lakh troops to work overseas. Over 74000 were killed and 80,000 were made prisoners.

Sources

- *Gandhi's Auto Biography; Experiment of Truth.*
- *Stanley Bopert, Jinnah*
- *Article by Shashank Joshi, 5 August 2014 Hindu, Allahabad*

An ashram was established in Bihta near Raghavpur village in 1927 summers with the help of Pt. Ram Bahadur Sharma and Paramhans Sita Ram Das. The ashram was named Shri Sitaram Ashram under the name of Paramhans sage Sitaram Das. This Ashram became a symbol of social movement. In the administration of Ashram council members were Rajandhari Singh as Dy. Head and Swami Vasudevacharya as a member. In the regularising council were Ram Bahadur Sharma as Dy. Head and Swami Parankushacharya as member. Both councils were headed by Swamiji. In future, landlords stood against this Ashram. Opposition by landlords taught Swamiji what it meant from

donations in the name of meetings for welfare of caste and religion. People become puppets in the hands of rich in such meetings. Under circumstances these wealthy people propagated their so called patriotism with the help of money. They continued exploiting farmers in the name of caste and continued to flourish by serving the ruling coalition. Swamiji unleashed such motives through his book "किसानों को फंसाने की तैयारियाँ" (Plans to trap the farmers). Landlords were led by Kavindra Narayan Singh in Varanasi, Chandrashekhar Narayan Singh in Maksudpur estate, Hathua Raja, Sir Ganesh Dutt Singh, King of Tamkuhi etc. Swamiji was accompanied by—Ram Dayalu Singh (Muzzafarpur), Dhanraj Sharma (Patna), Ram Subhag Pandey, Gokul Rai from Bharauli near Vishambharpur, Raghuveer Narayan Singh (Meerut), Mangal Dev Sharma and Saryu Singh etc. Youths and farmers were alongside Swamiji. Swamiji was in majority. In 1929 Swamiji ended these caste based meetings forever. Swamiji concluded-Caste meetings demotivate and dilute the sense of fraternity amongst the farmers, thus an obstacle in freedom. Participation of Swamiji on sectional scale thus came to an end. Swamiji opined "Caste associations are formed for dividing the farmers and prohibiting class consciousness in them".

In 1926, Dr Rajendra Prasad played an important role in electing the council's candidate. He provided ticket to his brother-in-law Jaleshwar Prasad instead of famous leader of liberals Shrinandan Babu. Even famous philanthropist Ganesh Babu was deprived of this. Due to Swamiji's personality both candidates of Lala Lajpat Rai and Pt. Madan Mohan Malviya's Independent Party namely Ganesh Dutt and Shrinandan Babu won. Landlords were not ready to share same turf along with common people. They considered praising the govt. officers and propagating service of the rulers as their only duties. They feared being jailed. As a result, in the Non-Co-operation movement the bureaucrats, wealthy and middle class comprised only a small portion of those

being jailed and almost 92 per cent of the prisoners comprised of farmers. Thus the influence of the peasants increased in the Sadakat Ashram of Bihar and the political influence of the urban middle class declined. Social base of Congress underwent a quality change. The truth was that the exploitation opposing struggle only propelled the empire opposing struggle. Thus it was natural that after the establishment of farmers in Congress the stature of their leader Swami Sahajanand Saraswati also enhanced. This became the backdrop of the peasant politics. Welfare of peasants remained the sole motive of Swamiji throughout his life. His anti feudal struggle gave impetus to anti-imperialistic war. The struggle against exploitation of Zamindars was extended to struggle against British Raj subsequently.

For the record actions of the colonial British dispensation since the First War of independence 1857 that have been well documented by historians reveal the lengths to which the colonial power went, after crushing the revolt, disarming the Indians, to sow seeds of deep distrust between India's two largest religious communities, Hindus and Muslims. Distance and distrust had been generated by Britishers to serve their interests. Gandhi and Jinnah played their role in aggravating the distrust which suited the Britishers. Swami Sahajanand had learnt from his life's struggle that Gandhi and his philosophy is inadequate for Hindu-Muslim unity, emancipation of working mass from Zamindar's oppression as Gandhi sought succour compromise and collaboration with the British rulers. Gandhi had helped Britishers in war in South Africa, in First World War in India and in indigo movement in Motihari in 1919 by abandoning and betraying the movement. Gandhi himself had accepted the importance of religion in politics and drove Jinnah in communal politics as well. Gandhi had the support of Zamindars in 1919; during indigo movement.

EXPERIENCES OF JAIL

Swamiji was first arrested on 2nd January 1922 in Gazipur. He observed that Gandhiji's rule of "Following Jail's regulations, working in Jail, for no-sloganeering, were not being followed by first and second class prisoners but also by he political prisoners, who were national leaders".

Swamiji was imprisoned for overall 13 months with severe imprisonment. Soon he was sent to Banaras Jail. There he was provided his own clothes. There were others also such as Kriplani, Sampoornand and Baba Raghavdas*. There were others also who used to have altercations with jail employees to avail better services. However, Swamiji thought—"How deep we shall fall if we accept such facilities? If this is what they were looking for then why they left their jobs and councils?" Swamiji was in politics for principles and thus it was not possible for him to abandon the Principle. Kriplani was of jocular nature. He enjoyed by troubling the jail employees and others.

Soon Swamiji was sent to Faizabad Jail. After hardly spending one month in Banaras and Gazipur Jail and 2 months in Faizabad Jail, he was moved to Lucknow Jail. Most part of his time in Jail was spent on reading Geeta and its evaluation. On 26th March 1922 a Marwari sent him a small version of Geeta. He also had a flair for Geeta. He studied all available forms in different languages. In prison, Swamiji got the opportunity to go through

* Kriplani was Gandhiate, Sampurnanand advocated for vedanti socialism and Baba Raghav Das was militant Nationalist. The Marwari mentioned was publisher Beri of Pishach Mochau Benares.

Geeta in an independent manner. Independent study opened his vision, old meaning has taken a new form. Like a new shine, independent thoughts blossomed — he was now re-energized. Swamiji understood the true meaning, reasons and logic of Geeta. Peace that eluded him, even after studying various epics and books thoroughly, was provided by Geeta in Faizabad Jail. He had a clear objective in his mind now. He understood the meaning of Geeta and its content and its intent.

Swamiji used to prepare his own food in Jail. There he met Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru. In mid hot sun Nehruji reached his barrack to understand Gita regularly. Swamiji was greatly influenced by this gesture. Nehruji gained high respect in eyes of Swamiji. This arrangement continued till the end in Lucknow Jail. Differences between both came into picture later in 1937. Nehruji came to Swamiji's main assistant's Ashram in Niyamatpur (Gaya) to prepare the outline and flag of Farmer organisation. Nehruji and Narendra Dev were of the view that the flag should be tri-colour thereby meaning that Peasant council works under the framework of Congress and therefore do not emphasise on peasant-landlord struggle. At that time, landlords were the propagators of Congress. Swamiji, Subhash Chandra, Indulal, Yagnik, Yadunandan Sharma, Karyanand Sharma, Rahul Sanskratayan, Sohan Singh Bhakana, Sohan Singh Josh, Shardul Singh which were symbol of struggle etc. were of the view that flag should be red coloured which was passed in Niyamatpur in 1937. However, this was at later instance in 1937.

Swamiji had an issue with Lokmanya Tilak also that he has taunted on Adi Shankar only because he failed to properly understand the intent of Shankar in his valuable book '*Geeta Rahasya*'. Adi Shankaracharya's whole life was full of work

* *Geeta Rahasya* is a treatise on Geeta by Tilak who was father of Indian Nationalism. He misunderstood Adi Shankar in his treatise. Sahajanand in his treatise cleared the confusion and misunderstanding.

with dedication and useful work. He never considered the Karma of scholars as Karma. Rather Shankar considered 'Karma' to be an action that provided happiness or sorrow to the doer. That's why Krishna's and scholar's (Gyani) Karma is not Karma because it cannot bind them in happiness and sorrow. Thus on one hand where Shankar supported such selfless Karma and followed it throughout his life, he also supported abandoning of motive-laced karma. In such state, Tilak's criticism of Shankar's Geeta Bhasya deviating from selfless work and dedication were thus baseless. Here meaning of scholar is Gyani. Shankar was himself a Karma yogi.

Congress session was held under the leadership of C.R. Das in 1922 in Gaya. His proposal of entering into the council was not accepted. This was accepted at a later stage through Swaraj Party after Gandhi-Nehru-Das agreement. Maulana Azad also favoured Das. Swamiji was active in Gazipur in 1923 and 1924. He was member of regional Congress Committee and All India Congress Committee. In Lucknow Jail Swamiji met another Political prisoner Ch. Raghuveer Narayan Singh who was a liberal social worker and Prof. Dharamveer M. A. Swamiji read Hindi version of Quran in jail and got exposed to an alternative theology. He used to have discussion with Maulana in Jail. Swamiji wrote about this:

"The thing is that we do not properly understand the religion of each other. Thus there are a lot of misconceptions. Obviously these are baseless."

In reality the fight amongst the religions is not due to beliefs but due to superstitions. Religions often fight on basis of these superstitions. Different religions don't have different thoughts as their core. All of them have synonyms of heaven, hell, oblivion, donations, pilgrimage, prayer, rebirth etc. Only the superstitions of religions, lead to differences. Supremacy of

these superstitions is the cause of lack of dialogue. If there is a dialogue between the religions along with welfare of society and moral belief, then there would not be any clash. Swamiji propagated such dialogues and set aside the differences.

It was not clearly visible that a new compelling force was needed in the struggle but it was not clear in his mind in those days. What is Revolution? What is the aim of revolution? Which is the motivating propelling force in revolution? What are forms of struggle, issues and basic principles? Swamiji was unaware about all these before 1934 although he had the glimpse of class struggle in 1927 when he dissolved Bhumihar Brahaman Mahasabha and formed eastern Patna Zila Kisan Sabha. However his experience were causing upheaval within him. As a result of this upheaval in 1927, West Patna Kisan Sabha was established. The initial objective was to make landlords understand to decrease the exploitation.

Kisan Sabha not only went changes in structure but also with the changing circumstances underwent changes in objectives, issues and methods. Increasing peasant strength led to a shake amongst the national level parties. Swami Sahajanand came up as the spearhead over the period of time. Increased awareness amongst peasant made British to even suspect the Army. Peasant council provided different parties with valuable cadres and propelled the revolution to the lowermost section of the nation thereby providing a new ray of cultural re-emergence. All eminent writers and journalists of the time: Rambriksh Benipuri (Editor of Janta), Ramdayal Pandey (Co-editor of Janta and writer in Hunkar), Rahul (Editor of Hunkar), Dinkar, Nagarjun (Writer of Balachnama), Mahashweta Devi (Writer of Agnigarbha), Prabhakar Machwe, Agney, Mayagupt, Pandey Bechan Sharma, Pt. Padam Singh Sharma and Mulkraj Anand, all of them got influenced through peasant struggles. Peasant movement also left an impact on 'Renu' in his "Maila Anchal" work.

In Salt Satyagraha of 1930 Swamiji was jailed for 6 months. He faced same old sour experiences while his stay was first at Bankipur (Patna) and then in Hazaribagh Jail. He formulated.

“The freedom we are looking for can only be obtained through non-compromising and undeviating approach for struggle.”

This formulation was contrary to the view point of Gandhi and his associates. Unconditional withdrawal of Non-Co-operation movement lead to dissatisfaction and dejection across the nation. Pulling the plug of Peasant struggles, labour strikes and student agitations led to division of unity in the name of castes and sections. As a result, the struggle against Imperialism became weaker. In Swamiji's words:

“Leaders declined to fight to snatch independence out of the hands of imperialists and entered into an agreement with British. Resultant of this agreement there were riots across the nation leading to people facing fear and destruction”.

Swamiji went through other experiences in jail. He writes in his autobiography:

“Those who have become leaders today and are acting as the sole source of sustenance in parts of Bihar, they all were in Hazaribagh Jail. Disturbance in their political thinking was clearly visible there. In this matter, how is their inner conscience, how is their mental makeup now? I cannot be fooled by their talks”.

Leaders of Bihar Congress were mostly Zamindars. Head of Bihar Congress, Rajendra Prasad was also a Zamindar.

By the end of first Quarter of 1931, Gandhiji entered into an agreement with British and as a result Swamiji was released

from Jail. In the meanwhile, British conveniently executed revolutionaries Bhagat Singh, Rajguru and Sukhdev. Hanging of Bhagat Singh* thrilled the whole country. At that time there was no other leader having similar stature such as of Bhagat Singh. This lead to such an anger across the nation that the government was confused. Sacrifice of Bhagat Singh proved out to be the declaration to kick out the British. Anti Imperialist struggle was upto now dependent on the fierce approach of Tilak. This was the propelling thought. Sacrifice of Bhagat Singh led to Socialism taking the position of propelling force. British hurted themselves by awarding death to Bhagat Singh and all of a sudden socialism became popular across India. Now. Socialism became the motivating force for anti imperialist, anti feudal , anti capitalist struggle and farmers were awokened.

This qualitative change came in 1931 but the result were visible only by 1935 when in congress session there was a huge congregation alongside Congress in Lucknow in 1936, through Subhash in 1938 in Haripura and in Ramgarh in 1940 March. This was an era of socialism.

From mid-1940 to second week of March 1942, for two years Swamiji was in jail under rigorous imprisonment. This imprisonment was resultant of his interference. Now he was free from Gandhiji's ideology and was accompanying Subhash Chandra Bose. Swamiji faced many tortures during two years stay in jail for calling out to throw out the British during the meeting in Ramgarh and for the calling out to forcefully kick out British in his speeches in Mangal Talab (Patna), Bankipur Ground (Patna) and Bihar Shareef. Subhash Chandra was kept under vigil. Subhash Chandra along with Swamiji gave clarion

* Bhagat Singh was most popular most understood leader of Intellectuals and of Hindustan Socialist Republican Army. Bhagat Singh was hanged with consent of Gandhi. No one dared to oppose Gandhi and execution except Subhash among top leaders.

call "Give us Either Death or Freedom". British Quit India Movement started under Subhash Chandra Bose and Swamiji on 19th March 1940 in Ramgarh in which they were accompanied by Yogendra Shukla, Kavivshwar Shardul, Dhanraj Sharma, N. G. Ranga*, Nariman, H. V. Kamath, Kishori Prasann Singh, Yadunandan Sharma, Dhanraj Sharma, Sheelbhadra Yaji, Soli Batliwala, Padmakant Malviya, Miyan Akhbar Shah and Ashrafuddin Chouhdary, H.V. Kamath, Shankar Lal, Som Nath Lahiri, Ramkrishna Khatri and others.

Belatedly Gandhiji first joined Quit India Movement on 9th August 1942 in Mumbai. At that time Japan was winning on several battlefields. With the defeat of Alliance Nations and victory of Axis Power, series of Crips Agreement, Cabinet Mission Agreement, Wavell Agreement started. As a result of these agreements India gained its freedom in the form of partition on 15th August 1947, the status being in the dominion not as having sovereignty.

During his stay in Hazaribagh Jail, Leader of Congress Socialist Party Jaiprakash Narayan told Swamiji that he wanted to form a new party called 'People's Party' and requested for support from him and Kisan Sabha. However, Swamiji didn't find his proposal suitable. He wanted that the money, equipment and cadres should be that of the farmers. Only in such arrangement will the party take care of the interests of the peasants. He was of the view that the party formed with the resources from Urban middle class, money from wealthy and press from mill owners cannot do well for the general working public.

"I do favour to provide the ruling authority in hands of wage earning from by snatching it from others. However I

* N.G. Ranga was oxford returned peasant leader of Andhra, Kavivshwar Shardul Bikram Singh was revolutionary nationalist of Punjab. Yogendra Shukla was famous revolutionary. Nariman was distinguished barrister of Bombay.

oppose the move of taking it away from others through compromise. We will have to fight to gain it. Then only we shall be able to sustain it. If it is received with ease, it shall be again snatched away. This is the truth and I am devoted towards fulfilling my dream."

"For this we need to prepare strong activists and need to prepare a group of new leaders. But those who do not foresee a radical economic agenda for farmers and labourers and are not working towards uniting them towards the struggle cannot be our leader or activists."

"I don't want bookish knowledge. Only bookish knowledge leads to unfaithfulness. I want a struggle and strugglers. I oppose freedom struggle without any economic struggle. I want economical and political revolution and this cannot happen in any other way. I will anyway support those people but after being bored of the party based politics I fear joining any political party. Neither will I allow anyone to join".
(My life Struggle, Swami Sahajanand).

Clearly, he was annoyed with *pandagiri* of political parties. In 1932 sugar mill was established in Bihta. Bihta lies on Patna Mughal Sarai rail route near Patna. Mill was owned by Ram Krishna Dalmiya. Rajendra Prasad was the Director of the mill. At the time of setting up the mill, land owners were lured through sweet talks. They were told—labourers shall be provided proper residence, sugarcane yield shall be paid high, labourers shall be paid high wages, schools shall be established. After the work was completed, all these proved out to be hollow promises. Other sugarcane mills in Bihar used to pay price of 6 aana per 40 Kg.

However, Dalmiya and his directors used to pay just three aana for the same yield. Swamiji was hurt by this. Further on this, mill owners tried but failed to snatch the rights

of farmers by granting funds to Swamiji's ashram in the name of development funds. They proposed to pay 10000 in one go and 200 per month. Swamiji lost his temper and shouted:

"I shall pull out your tongue! Run away from here. You tried to lure me. Shall I snatch the rights of farmers?"

Dalmiyas ran away. In fact this was an attempt to absorb the life out of the farmers and to compensate it a bit by building library and schools in the ashrams. Few clever leaders try to act smart by collecting funds from wealthy and claiming themselves as the friend of poor. They exploit poor and gain profit out of it. Their freedom gets restricted and the exploitation increases. Swamiji had huge faith on the public as well as in his own potential. He was mostly dependent on the common people and thus all his hopes were dependent on the labour and farmers only. He was taunting about Gandhi and his followers for their so called constructive work with the help of millowners.

Swamiji established Farmer-labour axis at Bihta Sugar Mill and organised three strikes at the mill. First in January 1936, second in January 1938 and third in 1938-39. In first strike, peasants were on strike. In second both farmers and labours were involved. Their leader Shyamnandan Singh and Anil Mitra were friends. On third occasion only labours were on strike. Dalmiya has to bow down and the demands were accepted. Labours were supported through strikes of peasants and peasants were supported through strike of labours. In this instance Benipuri was also active. Putting light on the experiences during the incidence Swamiji says:

"People with Permanent interest and intentions are very weak. I also observed that farmers and labours cannot survive without supporting each other."

Swamiji got to know the secret behind the "creative work" of

rich and tactics adopted by leaders to fool them. Unknowingly he gained the access to penetrate into the political arrangement through establishment of the farmer-labour front for protecting the farmer labours interest. This became the path of the political revolution. However, this was just the beginning.

In Bihar earthquake in 1934 several poor lost their means. They became homeless, their fields and godowns were destroyed. Even though they were starving, landlords continued to charge high taxes. Those from other castes who were exploited by the landlords also came to Swamiji. Swamiji raised a storm against the landlords and landlords discontinued to grant funds to ashram and also discouraged others to discontinue so that ashram becomes non-operational. Swamiji decided that ashram shall remain functional and shall be run through farmers. Resistance from landlords elaborated what it meant by donations in the name of caste and religion.

Earlier, Swamiji started a monthly journal in 1915 named *Bhumihi Brahman* from Benaras. Three students provided help in the functioning. Each student paid Rs. 20 as capital and thus the journal was published with the capital of Rs. 60. Later on the journal bought a press. Swamiji writes:

"I have experienced that if sincere efforts are put into any activity then money shall not be an obstacle."

At the later stage the press became private property of one of the student. Swamiji writes:

"Actually money is a factor which can make anyone loose his faith."

Culprit was a resident of Govardhan Sarai, Benares.

Swamiji was very strict about maintaining simplicity and sincerity in his daily living.

By the summers of 1927, he bought a press in Samastipur.

Yamuna Karyi was very helpful in this. One journal was published named *Loksangrah*. Geeta's 'Loksangrah' was the title and Swamiji was the editor. Later this press moved to Patna.

After some time, with the help of Benipuri and Jaiprakash, *Janta* was published. Benipuri was its editor. Ramdayal Pandey was the co-editor. Swamiji had to face a lot of trouble for *Janta*. After this *Hunkar* was also published from Patna. It was edited by famous scholar Rahul Sanskratayan from the beginning itself. In 1945 Swamiji himself worked as its editor. His co-editors were Indradeep Sinha and Awadh Bihari 'Suman' respectively. These phrases were published in each edition of *Hunkar*:

O ocean what roar of yours should I hear,
I am the roar of millennium itself.

Rahulji and Indradeep Sinha had to resign from the post of editor and co-editor for publishing blameful editorials on Subhash and Jaiprakash. Swamiji had differences with Subhas and Jaiprakash but he considered them as patriots. Even though there were differences, Swamiji never liked that they were blamed in public. The cause of differences with Subhas was on his line of armed rebellion. Swamiji wanted to revolutionize the peasants and labourers under the leadership of Subhas but Subhas in a haste left the country to fight the war from outside and propagate direct rebellion. Both had the same vision and target but the medium was different. Swamiji was for organised mass uprising through class struggle whereas Subhas was for impulsive nationalistic rebellion based on mass appeal. Both were complementary-supplementary to each other. Both were respectful to each other. Swamiji believed that only Subhash is capable and suitable to lead the Left Front whereas Subhash regarded Swamiji as ideologue, formulator and activist. Their combination was perfect.

54 | *Swami Sahajanand Saraswati*

Uptill 1940, Jinnah was ambassador of Hindu Muslim unity. Due to intrigues of Gandhi and betrayal in U.P. 1937 election out of frustration, he determined to become the leader of Muslims on par with Hindu Gandhi. The rise of Gandhi and his Hindu cult politics ultimately sowed the seed of partition. Both Gandhi and Jinnah played opportunistic religious politics. Obstinate Jinnah proved to be heavy weight against Gandhi. Both Jinnah and Savarkar switched to communal politics due to manaeuvering and planning of Gandhi. Gandhi was master of stratagem skillful planning and employed artifice tactics against his opponents. Malviya, Lajpat, Motilal, C.R. Das, Jinnah, Subhash, Shajanand all opponents of Gandhi were forced to leave Congress. Gandhi was dictator and extra constitutional authority of Congress. He was obstinate and intolerant. He did not live on logic and reason. He was pre-capitalistic in outlook and was against science and scientific thought. He liked feudal mode of production like charkha. He wanted to build modern Indian on feudal believes and means. He was a clever lawyer in the garb of Mahatma. His Brahmcharya was farce. His nonviolence was matter of convenience, not of conviction. He was involved in the murder of Rambhuj Dutt Chaudhary of Punjab whose wife was famous Sarala Tagore. His opponent Lala Lajpat Rai was killed in suspected manner. His rival in popularity Bhagat Singh was hanged at the advice of Gandhi. Gandhi forced to dead Army in Kashmir in 1948.

REFERENCES

1. *Trial of Bhagat Singh*, A.G. Noorani, Oxford University Press.
2. *Mahatma, Mohan Das*, Rajmohan Gandhi.
3. *Autobiography of Mehnath Desai*.
4. *Vid Pal Book (America)*
5. *Mira and Mahatma*, Sudhir Kakkad.
6. *Manu's Diary*, published in India Today.
7. Articles published in *Oulook and India Today* at various times.
8. Speech of Sahajanand, Ramgarh, 1940.

BACKDROP OF PEASANT REVOLUTION

Towards the end of decade of 1920 the struggle against the imperialism came to a halt. After the Chauri-Chaura incident, Gandhiji abandoned Non-Co-operation movement. After the coup in Turkey, the idea of Khilafat itself become irrelevant. The struggle being fought on the Indian turf to support the Turkish ruler met with a blow with the rise of Mustafa Kamal Pasha in Turkey. Those, Maulanas involved in the struggle joined the league. As a consequence, Hindus also got involved in organizing themselves. Fear of conversion propelled both the groups into the religious riots. In the same course Aryasamaji Swami Shraddhanand and Revolutionary Ganesh Shankar Vidhyarthi were murdered. Public got demotivated and there was the environment of dejection. People wanted to participate in the anti-British struggle but leaders were involved in some so called creative work. The lull in actuality helped Britishers.

A 'B' team of congress was formed to oppose the Congress by C.R. Das, Motilal Nehru and Vitthal Bhai Patel* etc. But Motilal became a member of the scan committee and Vitthalbhai became the speaker in the parliament. Thus Swaraj Party entered into the council. But its members were also dejected. Congressmen opposing the entry into the council, in the absence of any action plan were also lost in the dejection.

* Vitthal Bhai Patel was an elder brother of Vallabhbhai Patel. He was fan of Subhas Chandra Bose inspite of the fact that he was moderate. He donated his whole property to Subhas for advancing revolutionary struggle but Vallabhbhai managed to take back by his manoeuvering and intrigues.

56 | *Swami Sahajanand Saraswati*

Lala Lajpat Rai and Madan Mohan Malviya's Independent party was also directionless in the absence of any strong propaganda. Three wings of Congress were facing internal quarrels and Gandhiji was also a victim of indecision. Infusion of new energy was the demand of the situation. Bureaucrats were also mesmerized. General mass was also disheartened due to inaction.

Revolutionaries were fed up of dacoities and violence. Bhagat Singh did a lot of evaluation on the revolution and pronounced to the youths on 2nd Feb. 1931:

"If instead of only the middle class, whole nation wants to fight for the freedom then we require to pull farmers, labours and common man on the front and organize them for the struggle. The Congress shall end in a way in the form of an agreement". Bhagawati Charan Bohra an ideologue of the party was also advocating for the same.

Ram Prasad Bismil in his biography accepted the fact before his hanging that "the path of violence, terrorism and murder is not correct. It would have been better if I would have worked towards organizing the peasants and labours."

After the hanging of Bhagat Singh and Bismil* group, the youths, farmers, labours, students all were looking eagerly for new leadership to be taken up at earnest in a determined manner and in different way.

This thirst was present in the Patna meet of peasant council (Kisan Sabha) but future was looking forward to take shape. Bhagat Singh's dream proved out to be the starting point for Swamiji. However even Swamiji was not aware of it at that moment fully.

Western Patna Peasant council was formed towards the end of 1927. However it gained recognition on 4th March 1928 only.

* Ram Prasad Bismil was hanged with Ashfaulla Khan, Ratendra Lohiri and Roshan Singh.

This was the first organized union of farmers in the country. All the rules, objectives, membership and eligibility of the council were decided. Even the small landlords were also its members. Council came into being to bring an equilibrium amongst the interest of Landlords and peasants and had conciliatory approach at that time. This was also the principle of Congress. After 1937 the nature of peasant councils underwent qualitative changes according to the changing environment, issues and political arrangement. At last, only small farmers and labours continued to be its drivers. This new arrangement began to take shape in 1938. Under circumstances, peasant council underwent many changes in the objectives, fundamental principles and methods and over a period of time it crossed the boundaries defined by Gandhiji and came into direct competition with the Congress, Congress socialist and communist parties. This event of transformation is quite interesting. Peasant council was a reformist organization in the beginning. But later it transformed into a revolutionary council. Swamiji remained its propagator and struggler through-out. His accomplices included Yadunandan Sharma, Rahul Sanskratayan, Nagarajuna, Rambriksh Benipuri and Indulal Yagik. In between for small durations Jaiprakash, N. G. Ranga, Mohan Lal Gautam, Purshottam Das Tandon and Acharya Narendra Dev also came along. Congress Socialist Party developed a conflict with Peasant council in 1941. In 1942 N. G. Ranga also parted ways. In 1945 alongwith Rahul and Karyanand Sharma, communist party also got separated. Since 1939 to 1940 Swami Sahajanand, Subhash Chandra and Communist Party were together. In 1942 Forward Block also developed differences with the Peasant Council. Swamiji and Peasant council were influenced by the patriotism and bravery of Subhash Chandra but his concept of Armed Rebellion and joining hands with Germany-Japan was not acceptable to them. Swamiji was for class struggle

as main form and was against all kind of imperialism

Ramdayalu Singh, Shri Krishna Singh and Baldev Sahay were from the Swaraj Party. Ramdayalu later became the speaker in Bihar Legislative Council. In 1929, Yamuna Karyi, Ramdayalu Babu and Swamiji decided to give peasant council a regional form. Shri Krishna was chosen as the council Secretary and Yamuna Karyi*, Gurusahay Lal and Kailash Bihari were appointed as regional councillors. They were properly organized on the Kartik Poornima in Sonpur festival in 1929. Except Brij Kishore Prasad, all prominent congress leaders took part in it. But by 1934 except Yamuna Karyi and Swamiji, all congressmen stood up in opposition to Peasant council. Congress was itself not dead against feudalism, imperialism and its doors were open for all including peasant and landlords. Congressmen viewed congress as a weaker party on their stance of opposing landlords. Then the question was when there are peasants in congress itself, what is the need for different peasant council? But Landlords and Peasants had conflicting interests. Peasant council viewed politics from the economic perspective. Landlord oppression-exploitation wave which started at that time resulted in the Tsunami for uprooting of landlords and British who protected landlords. Peasant struggle only provided the national struggle a form and aggressive approach which helped in breaking the stagnation in the national struggle. Increased interest of peasants in the politics thrilled the British. Indian Armymen became suspicious in the eyes of British. Since it were the sons of farmers and labours who were working in factories and so the students of universities. Increased awareness amongst the soldiers, labours, students, youths and farmers forced the imperialists to bow down and negotiate with friendly Congress led by Gandhi.

* Yamuna Karyi, was scholar activist of Kisan Sabha loyal to Swamiji. He was editor, manager owner of "Lok Sangrah and Hunkar" foremost magazine of Kisan Sabha. Beniour yogi Loksangrah and Janata.

Another Peasant Council was formed in the name of 'United Party' by King of Suryapura Estate Radhika Raman Singh, Maulana Azad, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Shivshankar Jha and Gurusahay Lal. Doma Singh from Punpun became the instigators. Ambika Kant Singh, Barrister Devki Prasad and Gurusahay Lal became the councillors. Landlords wished that through this party a Peasant-landlord agreement should be entered into and a draft for transferring 10 percent land of the peasants land to landlords in the form of personal cultivations should be passed. Swamiji got the information about the formation and their plan. Their intentions were unleashed. In the wake of increased peasant agitation the newly formed council vanished. New Kisan Party was formed with the funds from Land Holders Association and was short-lived. It could not withstand the onslaught by mass leader Swami Sahajanand.

A tenancy bill was prepared by Rai Bahadur Sharata Sahay on the side of landlords and presented in the council. Original Peasant council presented the following proposal—"Peasant council oppose this draft on the basis of fundamentals and demand to govt. to stop this tenancy bill on this basis."

Raja Radhika Raman got inspired from the peasant rallies in Patna and wrote 'Daridra Narayan' (Lord of Poor) wherein the lord is Swamiji itself. Literature is often influenced by the happenings of the society. Swamiji was not lured into the honey talks of Raja Radhika Raman. Raja Raman himself was a Zamindar. Swamiji writes in his biography:

In the history of peasant council there was the upheaval. Due to this only I got pulled towards it, or it would be better to say that original Bihar Peasant Council and Peasant struggle got initiated with this.

Peasant council gained acceptance due to this and Swamiji got established as the foremost person for propagating the peasant

interests. Swamiji provided ground to the struggle and held hundreds of rallies across the province. Dictator of congress Satyanarayan Singh stood against the peasant council: (Kisan Sabha)

Existence of two councils is self-destructing. Farmers and their organizers should stop their activities and should put in their efforts in congress because peasant can win only if congress wins.

Afterwards, Dictator Vinodanad Jha provided his support to the peasant council. During the prison movement, the leadership in the congress kept on changing and so was their relations with the peasant council. Zamindari abolition was the most important aspect for Swamiji. Only satisfying the interest of landlords in the name of sacrificing the peasant interest was no way good for national politics. Swamiji invoked new energy into the old Peasant Council and pressured govt. to take back the personal cultivation clause. He provided a unique leadership to the peasants, well organized, well trained, well disciplined with vigorous activism to capture the state power forcefully by overthrowing the all kinds of exploiters. This was unacceptable to Birla, Bajaj, Dalmia, Tata and Gandhiaites*.

Basics of the Peasant council are determined by the agricultural condition and political issues. They must be satisfying and people centric. Leadership was not influenced by the Gandhian philosophy anymore.

Gandhiji said: "My trusteeship has been laughed at but I am still firm on it." Gandhiji wrote in Young India on 18th May 1929:

At any stage in the Non-Co-operation struggle it was never considered that we shall deprive landlords of their taxes.

* Gandhiaites were the political representatives of landlords and comprador big Bourgeoisies. Gandhi had Guru who all were foreigners including Tolstoy, Ruskin, Ballwin, Thore and others.

This arrangement was not acceptable to Swamiji. Swamiji gained support from Famous revolutionary M. N. Rai, Subhash Chandra Bose and Pt. Nehru before 1939-40.

In the 45th session at Kolkata in December 1928, Gandhiji under the precedence of Motilal Nehru, presented the draft of colonial freedom – or partial freedom. Subhash Chandra Bose didn't like this idea. Partial freedom was not acceptable to him. He presented a redraft against Dominion freedom:

I pity that I am altering the proposal presented by Mahatma Gandhi who is supported by many experienced leaders. If you want to over-come this mentality of being slaves then it can be done only through encouraging people to take up the fight for the complete freedom. All we want is complete freedom.

Both groups underwent tests and Pt. Jawaharlal Lal Nehru supported the redraft. Motilal Nehru supported Gandhiji. Gandhiji received 1350 votes while Subhash Chandra got 973 votes. J.L. Nehru changed side and switched over to Gandhi. He was always oscillating and wavering. He was pseudo socialist and only in name. Redraft was declined not due to differences in members but they feared that if Gandhiji lost then he would retire from the politics and they didn't wanted this. Redraft was declined but Subhash did not stumbled. He started organizing youths, students, labours and farmers and started way out towards freedom through enlightened awakened India. Congress became uninterested in compromising principles and developed following program ignoring the nationalist's opinion.

1. Organizing Peasants and Labours only for expanding the Congress.
2. Group of volunteers to safe guard meetings.
3. Demolishing untouchability system and superstitions but preserving the caste system.

4. Organizing Women forums only for rally purpose.
5. Developing literature for advertising and dividing public.
6. Diverting public from struggle.

The nationalists opined: "In our view Gandhi-Irwin agreement is absolutely disappointing. We are sorry that this agreement took place at a time when we were in more power". Bhagat Singh was hanged which disheartened general public.

On 2nd January 1932, Subhash Chandra Bose was imprisoned. Before coming of Swamiji into the peasant struggle, B. Ramchandra Reddy from Andhra and Sir Chotu Ram in Punjab was the leader of Zamindar Farmers. Khondar Rai who took Gandhiji to Champaran was a small landlord and Rajkumar Shukla was a money lender. Dharnidhar Prasad, Rajendra Prasad, Gaya Prasad, Ramnavmi Prasad, Gorakh Prasad and Anugrah Narayna were all Barristers and Zamindars. In Sanyukt province Baaba Ramchandra Das was the peasant leader. Jawaharlal Nehru has clearly described the circumstances in his biography wherein an organized Peasant union was in demand. Vallab Bhai Patel was the Barrister and Zamindar in Bardoli Struggle. N. G. Ranga from Andhra Pradesh was an oxford return. An independent organised peasant council was established only under the leadership of Swami Sahajanand Saraswati. Earlier issues were not truly directed towards their capture of state power. Swamiji directed them towards the main issues. According to govt. files 34/1931 SCRO Patna, Part III,

1. Cash Tax is Rs. 4 or 5 per beegha, however, landlords charge it at 9 or 10.
2. Landlords eat up the larger portion of the crop by doubling the taxes.
3. No receipt is provided against the tax paid.
4. Landlords auction the land by misquoting the due amount.

5. Landlords do not perform their duties and as a result peasant has to rely on the nature for irrigation.
6. Begari was prevalent.
7. Peasant's acceptance and free gifts was gained forcefully.

In instances, brides were asked to spend first night at the landlord's house. This was called Dola System wherein the peasant's respect was tarnished. Landlords enjoyed the hard laboured produce of peasants. Danabandi System was in vogue.

Permanent settlement was passed in 1793. Within 100 years of its passage, penury and harassment of peasants increased. Pt. Nehru accepted the division amongst the sections and he aimed at reducing the differences amongst the sections. He believed that wealthy and exploitative actions can be reduced only by consensus. This was his fabian socialism and Laxism. He had liberal idea and conciliatory approach. In Gujarat,

S. No.	District	No. of Cases
1.	Muzzafarpur	32369
2.	Saran	26699
3.	Darbhanga	26608
4.	Poorniya	27255
5.	Shahbad	19178
6.	Patna	18743
7.	Bhagalpur	18632
8.	Munger	17396
9.	Gaya	10475

8700 Patel rose up under Sardar Patel in Bardoli against the Patidar Tax. Legacy of Bhagat Singh, organization of labour and young by Subhash Chandra, rising up of upper sections of the rural section under Patel and Nehru's support for peasant struggle ensured that struggle against Imperialism cannot be carried

forward without the support of poor Peasants. To propagate the national struggle it became imperative to give importance to students, peasants, women and labours. In this context the struggling approach of Swamiji can be easily understood who represented the downtrodden and poor peasants.

Looking at the figures it becomes clear that the prices of grains began to rise in 1885. Exception were 1911, 1913, 1916 and 1918. It became stable in 1922 and 1927. Then in 1933 it came to the minimum level. In 1938 the prices were higher by 25-48 percent when compared to prices in 1918-29. This implied there was high recession between 1929 and 1938. Landlords were exploiting farmers through fake cases.

As per an application in Bihar and Orissa the no. of cases were 197386 in 1929 which became 118785 in 1933. It included money suits, rent suits and title suits also. Bihar Peasant Council described 43 types of exploitations:

1. Farmers were tied and rolled in the summer noon.
2. Shoe Garland was hung by neck and hands and legs were tied and were made to stand in sun.
3. Farmers were tied to poles in the stables.
4. Black pot was placed on head to display sense of social inferiority
5. Were kept starving in dark house.
6. Animals were unleashed.
7. A person from Dushadh caste was made to sit on the door so that no one goes out for toilet due to superstitious fear of touch of his hand shall lead to hell. There were no toilets in houses at that time.
8. They were barred from getting water from river banks.
9. Crops were forcefully snatched away for horses and elephants.
10. Corns were snatched away at will.

11. Wood was taken away for fuel without payments.
12. Free snatching of vegetables from farms.
13. Cattles were sold for pennies due to dues of rent.
14. Milkmen were made to provide milk and ghee free of cost.
15. Cobblers were made to make shoes free. Vegetables were snatched from Koris, an agriculturist caste.
16. Oil was purchased at half the market price.
17. On auspicious occasions potters were asked to provide clothes and utensils and were paid in pennies.
18. Quilts were snatched from grazers.
19. Washermen were made to wash clothes for free.
20. Ironsmith were asked to make vessels for free.
21. Broom and carpets were taken for free from pasis (today tappers)
22. Bullock cart were taken free.
23. Obstacles were created while sowing the field.
24. Standing crop was snatched or destroyed.
25. Cow and ox were snatched away.
26. Peasants were stopped and their farms were destroyed.
27. Horses were made to graze freely all around the Kisan field.
28. Even if the peasant was innocent, he was asked to pay fine.
29. Making house or keeping animals was restricted on farms where 'cash tax' was collected.
30. Filing cases for recovering interest, charging interests at compound interest and taxing the produce more than permitted were common phenomenon.
31. Punishing the witness against self.
32. Charging different types of expenses and taking 1Rs. as acknowledgement.
33. In cash Taxes, 1 Rs. additional was taken as acknowledgement.

66 | *Swami Sahajanand Saraswati*

34. Separate commission for tax payment.
35. Compelling farmers for pro-note.
36. Fining the one appealing in the peasant council. (Kisan Sabha).
37. Threatening with dire consequences in case of complaint.
38. Paying only a quarter to produce of a rupee.
39. Paying only 2 Rs. to weaver against Rs. 5.
40. Buying at a quarter price from cloth merchant.
41. Having free cut from barber.
42. Punishing peasant without any reason.
43. Abstracting tax from the peasant by gherao and asking him to pay for the constable expenses.

(*Gaya Zile ke Kishano ki Karun Kahani*, Author Swami Sahajanand Saraswati and *Bihar Peasantry and Kishan Sabha*, Author Rakesh Gupta)

According to page 43 of book *The History of Kishan Sabha* by Harkishan Singh Surjit:

In 1928-29 the average total value of farm products in 1928-29 was around 10340 million rupees which declined to 4370 million rupees in 1933-34. Fall in prices was about 55 per cent. Unpaid peasants in Uttar Pradesh were around 61440. Tax burden increased more than twice. With fall in price transport cost also increased more than twice. Peasants became penniless. Congress did not include the demands of farmers against the landlords in the Non-co-operation and civil disobedience movements. Census of 1931 figured out that the land is being snatched away from the non-cultivating farmers.

Rahul Sanskratayan wrote in 'Naye Bharat ke Naye Neta':

One who was attracted by Vedanta ever since he came into sense? One who left the comforts of the world to gain the

moksha, who would have imagined that the same person shall take oath to uplift the most dejected section with the help of most unrecognized education system in the world? A bright student who would have easily became an engineer, Lawyer or a bureaucrat. But he choose the other way, the ancient way of Indian system. He could have been a wellknown guru with hundreds of disciples. But he put his energy into the non-co-operation movement. One who experienced the pain of the suffering population. One who has worked for the upliftment of the peasant shall be always remembered. He is Swami Sahajanand.

Rahul Sanskratayan has mentioned about Swamiji in his Biography 'Meri Jeevan Yatra' as one having fearless dreams and acting as the strong leader of the one who were exploited. Swamiji and Rahul were united in 1933 through their motives and became inseparable till end.

Wearing Khdau* in foot, Gerua clothes on body, having dand in hands, medium built, attractive personality, large heart and blushing face, Swamiji was in true sense a representative of peasants. Swamiji took the sphere to a stage wherein it became possible to come out of the trap for India. He was a grounded fellow and was a messiah for farmers. He represented the people who were eagerly waiting for the upheaval.

He was sharp and was well-versed with the concepts. He was fierce in struggle and his speeches were laced in inspirations. He was against superstitions and exploitation. He raised the roaring voice against the exploitation by landlords.

Bihar was the center for the peasant revolution. The reason was the dejected state, deep rooted caste systems and the social and legal arrangement in the area. Tax system was much harsh in Bihar. As a result the explosion was huge which was further

* Khadau was a foot bear made of wool.

deteriorated by recession. Basic infrastructure was in pathetic state and there was external political environment. Landlords and Peasants were rural. Fall in prices of crop, increase in taxes unpaid labours were acts which ignited the flames of self-respect and prosperity. Revolution not only took birth due to dissatisfaction but was also shaped through it. Constant fall in prices of crops and wilful destruction of crops, increase in cases, and auctioning lead to ignition in the struggle.

Bihar was the center for Cultural Revolution in the beginning. The work of Langat Singh is appreciable in this context. Sir Ganesh Dutt was minister in local self-government in 1923. He donated freely for setting up infrastructure for education. Gauraiya Kathi, Krishnakant Babu was a small landlord who contributed in journalism and education. Sir Rameshwar Singh who was first Indian member in the council in 1912 made significant contribution in Sanskrit education system. Maharaja Tekari established the high school. Lord Sacchidanand Sinha, Hasan Immam and Ali Immam were the barristers who played important role in segregating Bihar from Bengal. In 1930, Landlord Rameshwar Babu was the chairman of the district board. Raja Radhika Raman Singh of Suryapura, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Anugrah Narayan Singh, Rajnidhari Singh of Dharhara estate S.K. Singh all were contributing in their own way to some extent. But, it all were in adequate.

After the start of peasant struggle, revolution came in sight of the people of lower sections. In the same go, Rambriksh Benipuri, Ramdhari Singh Dinkar, Nagarjuna, Rahul Sanskratayan etc. able journalists and writers evolved. Politics also underwent changes. Rajandhari singh was elected head of regional council in even before 1937. New generation was stepping into the politics. This generation was of farmers. Thus a new cultural renaissance grew up in Bihar after the advent of Kisan Sabha and Swami Sahajanand on Political stage of Bihar.

The movement produced eminent writers, journalists, poets, Historians in Bihar due to social mobility created by Swamiji and movement lead by him.

Shri Krishna Singh was the peasant leader in Munger, Prajapati Mishra from Champaran and Kishori Prassan Singh from Hazipur. In 1931-32. Kishori Prassan Singh was called 'Patel of Bihar'. He was the head of socialist party in Bihar. Katyanand Sharma came to peasant council in 1929. In 1934 became a member of congress socialist Party. He came in touch with Subhash Chandra Bose in 1939-40 and in 1940 he became communist in Hazaribagh jail on advice of Swamiji. Kishori Prasann Singh, Rahul Sankritayan, Nagarjun joined Communist Party. Dhanraj Sharma, Sheel Bhadra Yaji, K.N. Shandilya, Kameshwar Singh joined Foward Block Ram Nandan Mishra, Ganga Sharan Singh, Benipuri, Basawan Singh, Yogendra Shukla Suraj Naryan Singh, Karpouri Thakur all remained in Congress Socialist Party. Thus Kisan Sabha provided cadre new blood, new momentum to all parties. Shri Krishna Sinha went over to Congress. Nakshatra Malakar went over to C.P.I. Both Karpuri Thakur and Malukar have taken training under Swamiji in Sonpur Political training camp in 1938. Yadu Nandan Sharm and Indu Lal Yagnik (Gujarat) remained loyal to Swamiji till end on 21 Feb. 1950 Swamiji headed a Political Party Unites Socialist Party made of 18 left parties barring C.P.I. and C.S.P. He died on 26 June 1950. After death of Swamiji the Party got disinterred (Myron Wiener).

The idea of equality in Swamiji's crystallization had become dominant ones in Kisan movement which envisaged a society free of oppression, exploitation and *entitled* to fulfill its needs from the social products according to their fancy, complete freedom of choice of occupation with the highest *imaginable* degree of equality. It was a concern for the highest values of modern civilization. The idea of fraternity was enlarged to

embrace the people of whole world. The idea of liberty was given a new meaning where dictatorship had no place. This concept of Swamiji infuriated the C.P.I. which was for dictatorship of proletariat. Swamiji was for composite leadership of downtrodden classes. Peasant will be main force of impending revolution along with unorganized semi proletariats. Swami Ji was Marxist but was not orthodox or classical. His concept of Vedant and Marx was his own. He was Patriot at though he had world view and was internalist and well wisher of soviet but was not dogmatic. He was dead against Gandhi-Nehru leadership. He was dead against dictatorship attitude of parties. He was democrat Communist Party was structured on centralism, dictatorship, Gandhi-Nehru line of inaction. So, differences arose in 1940 and it aggravated after 1943. In 1944 at Bijaywada session of Kisan Sabha Swami Ji reminded C.A.S. not to indulge in Pakistan project of Britishers. In 1945 he par feed company. In 1948 C.P.I. Participa form united front of 18 left parties at Patna session but absconded in 1949 in Calcutta meeting. Swami Ji became head of united socialist organization on 21 Feb 1950.

KISAN HALCHAL

Landlords in Bihar, especially from central Bihar were very cruel. Farmers used to be thrilled by those landlords. A landlord in Dharhara destroyed the all produce just for one fruit. They sold the brides and daughters of farmers to abstract out their taxes. The farmers, there were so dejected that they dared not to open their mouths. These landlords were famous for their cruelty. Farmers feared marrying their daughters in that village. As a consequence the people there, were facing issue in getting married. Whole village was destroyed for a non-performing bounded labour. Peasant revolution started in this area in 1927. In regional festival of Sonpur in 1929, Provincial peasant council was formed, which was headed by Swami Sahajanand Saraswati and Yamuna Karyi, Gurusahay Lal, Kailash Bihari Lal were regional heads.

On 29th April 1934 regional council was re-elected in which Swamiji was the head, Baldev Sahay was dy. Head, Abdul Bari, Jaiprakash Narayan, Yamuna Karyi, Ambika Kant Sinha, Kishore Prassan Singh and Raas Bihari Lal were councillors.

In Peasant terms in 1934: "Peasant is a person whose subsistence is through farming. This include rich farmer also."

In Peasant term in 1943: "Starving Peasant, Poor Peasant, Tiny Peasant, Farm Labour is the real farmer." Rich farmers were excluded from this. Narendra Dev for rich farmers and Swami Sahajanand for poor farmers leadership were the propagators for the Peasant movement. Narendra Dev wanted the Kisan movement as this limit of Gandhi Politics and only

on strengthen the congress whereas Sahajanand wanted to establish Kisan Mazadoor Raj by overthrowing the British, Zamindar and Maldar. Perspectives were different.

In the meanwhile in 1930, in salt agitation Swamiji was arrested. He was sentenced for 6 months. He saw that how policemen took bribe for presenting false statements and duties. In 1931 regional congress observed the pathetic state of the farmers but what was the consequence of their report never came into light. It was symbolic not for implementation.

The purpose of the finding committee was to tell the farmers that their complaints shall be noted down and to assure landlords that their interests shall not be compromised with. This was just a game to get the works done from the farmers by giving them fake assurances. Neither was the report published nor was there any discussions in the newspapers. In the first peasant council organized in Sonpur on 15th December 1929 the constitution and regulation were defined. A proposal was passed to keep the movement non-violent and formation of organization upto village level also accepted:

1. Provincial Peasant Council
2. Regional Peasant Council
3. District Peasant Council
4. Peasant Thana Council
5. Village Peasant Council.

It was a five pointer structure. Bihar regional peasant council was provided rights to alter the constitution. In 1934 this constitution was changed to form programme based constitution wherein stands on increase in taxes, tax due and interest charging were clearly defined.

In summers of 1933 Peasant Council held a meeting in Patna wherein a finding committee was formed for investigating the peasant exploitation.

The following were the members:

Swami Sahajanand Saraswati

Pt. Yamuna Karyi – Propagator and Councillor

Pt. Yadunandan Sharma

Doctor Yugal Kishore Singh

Kumar Badrinarayan Singh

Report was mainly prepared by Swamiji, Yamuna Karyi and Yadunandan Sharma. Committee had members in Dhangava, Muhammadpur, Majhiyama, Bhor, Parasawan and Fatehpur. Written statements were collected from farmers. 45 types of illegal activities were noted down. Committee found the pathetic situation of the farmers and exploitation by the landlords and also observed the agitation in the peasant community. The area was on verge of explosion, just a push was needed.

Swamiji wrote to the Zamindars of Suryapura and Amava about the pathetic state but they were not moved.

They are shameless and strong person. They shall not move an inch. Instead they will try to fool me. But I am insightful now. All hopes have diminished. Now compromising shall not be the solution.

Alternative path was soon devised. First the report was published by the name of 'Pathetic state of Gaya District's Farmers' and then there started militant movements of the peasants.

This movement disturbed both govt. and the landlords. Swamiji proposed an act under the certificate and jeerat. Truth of false agreement with landlords was unleashed as well as their intention to rob. Landlord agent Shivshankar Jha faced a lot of humiliation. Swamiji now believed that these simple uneducated farmers cannot be fooled any longer. Lion* was killed in his

* Here Lion denotes Vallabh Bhai Patel who opposed Swamiji in Haripura Congress in 1938. Zamindars worship him as lion. Badri Narayan Singh was killed by zamindar leader of congress of Bhrangabad.

own den. This area of Gujarat was unknown to Swamiji yet peasant heard his talks. As a result tenancy bill could not be passed. When Jeerat clause was removed in 1934, only then it was passed. Raibahadur Shyamnandan Sahay was the pillar of United Party favouring the farmer-landlord agreement. Its content and so intent was exposed by swamiji. Zamindars had formed a fake Kisan Sabha and false agreement was reached with it who were them selves agents of Zamindars.

Vallabh Bhai Patel visited Bihar before the Lahore session scheduled on 15th December 1929. He was a strong supporter of rich peasant rights at that time. He praised the work done by Swamiji. In Lahore, with support of Nehru and Subhash Bose, proposal of complete independence was passed. Swamiji also became a member of All India Congress Committee. He was quiet happy when proposal for total freedom was passed.

In 1934, basic changes were made in the regulations of Congress. Swamiji sensed a threat for peasants in that. Swamiji resisted the change in draft in the Bombay session. This was the begining of altercation in Congress. It was based on the issue of farmers and their exploitation. This proved out to be the base of the struggle. With the peasant council coming into being old form of tenancy bill ended. Govt., recognized the Peasant council and accepted that it is the representative council for farmers. With partial or complete success it became an organization which was now confronting congress. As a result, by 1934 leaving Yadunandan Sharma and Yamuna Karyi, all other propagators stood against it. New activists such as Karyanand Sharma, Ram Chandra Sharma and Kishori Prasan Singh* came into picture. Peasant politics was revitalized. Swamiji launched Mansukhi's struggle in 1934. Congress socialist in this phase joined the movement.

* Kishori Prasan Singh was revolutionary. He ultimately joined C.P.I. through Kisan Sabha and C.S.P. Previously he was close to Bhagat Singh, Swamiji and Subhash Chander Bose.

In his speech in 1935 in Nasariganj Swamiji said:

I am here to organize a peasant council over here. You people will get a voice, landlords shall be asked to take the tax and not the interest on it so that peasant have their pie. It's upon you to will without any protest or at least to develop some space for yourself.

Swamiji's book 'Kishan Sabha ke Sansmaran' is an epic of instances faced by him through-out his life.

Swamiji called for making Peasant council as a separate, independent entity on 28th January 1935 in Muzzafarpur. He announced that no Tenancy bill shall be accepted which is against the interest of Farmers.

In Munger, he opposed the salute and certificate arrangement. He toured Bakhtiyarpur and Bhagalpur also. In December 1935 in Munger District Peasant council Mahant Siyaram Das was made the president and Karyanand Sharma was anointed councillor. Fourth Peasant meeting was held under the leadership of Swami Sahajanand. 70 big and 124 small meetings were organized and 6 protests were organized in Munger. In 1936 membership of the peasant council stood at 33000. In 1936 it increased to 60000. In 1938 it was 2-5 lacs.

Earlier Bihar state peasant council was open for all those who were dependent on farming.

In 1917 in Gazipur Swamiji saw a dead halwai in Maura village near Vishambharpur. He was lying on ground in a broken hut. He died of influenza in winter. He was only in his underwear. There was no bed or medicine for him. This was the pathetic state of the labour who produces lakhs for the landlords. Swamiji felt sickened and pathetic.

Second incident occurred in the hands of the traders of Munger under Chadak Thana. Santhals were innocent and laborious and that's why were looted. Swamiji's heart whispered:

where is truth and justice in this world? Where is non-violence? Where is the lord? Their truth makes them poorer and traders' cunningness makes them rich. Truth, justice and lord are just for the namesake.

In 1937 he saw corpse of a poor being taken to Ganga without wood for burning the body. Swamiji's heart said:

This is cruelty, this is loot. One who devoted whole of his life to produce for the riches is in such pathetic state. One who produced milk and wheat for other's consumption is being treated in such a heartless manner. This arrangement needs to be changed. Biggest non-violence, biggest truth is serving the poor. Leaving them how can I connect to lord? They are my lord.

Farmers were the lord for Swamiji. He spent his entire life for their betterment. He used to say "Bread is greater than God".

By end of 1934, Bombay session of congress concluded. Rajendra Prasad was the president. Gandhiji parted his ways from congress but only after altering the constitution. In the same session Gandhiji's demand of assembly entrance was accepted. Gandhiji proposed 4 aane membership fee for the same. Swamiji opposed this in the subject council.

When the current member remain in authority after paying 4 aane membership fee then where is the scope for peasant and poor? It shall go into the hands of landlords and riches who thereby using their wealth shall develop fake membership and consequently shall control congress.

Swamiji's suspicion proved out to be right. Congress was then controlled by people who were neither in mood of revolutionary change neither had they liked any peasant or labour councils of their liking. But yes they were comfortable with fake labour and peasant councils of their liking. Because it was the need of

the hour and it was necessary to keep people in illusion. But they got uncomfortable on hearing about the organized real Peasant council. Ganhaites to peasants but their mentality was in line with the landlords and riches. They tried to stuck talks on rural vs. urban. Thus cleverly they used to call village a place wherein landlords were in power and were involved in exploitation. Touts saw their victory in the village's resources. Majority though:

Gandhiji is about to leave congress so it would be better to accept his demands.

After expulsion of Subhash-Sahajanand from congress in 1939, it was taken over by riches. By 1935 Swamiji was able to pass the proposal of abolishing landlord system in Peasant council. Purshottam Das Tandon was made honorary head of second Bihar State Peasant council. Mohanlal Gautam from Uttar Pradesh was also present in the same. In the third Bihar State Peasant council in Hazipur proposal for abolishing the landlord system was also passed.

Swamiji believed that religion is the matter of personal belief and no two people can be same. Thus how can two people have same religion? He also believed that opposing the religion is a mistake. Though its aspects can be resisted. This can cause damage. Any resistance should have logic and support. One who knows about the religion should only interfere in it. One who is unaware should not get involved. Swamiji was facing the brunt of this fake revolution. But people who had studied in foreign considered it as an adventurous path and a source of gaining easy recognition. It was hard for them to face the heat of struggle. Free praise attract and also gives media publicity but that hampered the working of peasant council. Socialist now didn't had the courage to continue with the peasant struggle. They were only attracted by the crowd but never stayed. Then

there were eminent people like Narendra Dev, Yogendra Shukla, Kishori Prassan Singh, Indulal Yagik, Kamla Davi in C.S.P., Rahul Sanskratayan, Prithvi Karyanand Sharma who became instrumental in setting up of communist party in Bihar latter on.

Peasant council was held in Hazipur in 1935. Next year it was held in Beehpur. It was presided by Jai Prakash Narayan*. It was decided to publish 'Janta' and 'Jansahitya Sangh' from Beehpur. Swamiji always felt bad about the misuse of public money. Jai Prakash named him in the editorial team without his consultation. Swamiji writes:

I could not decline. This was a mistake and I had to pay for it.

Jai Prakash always had various sources of fund collection. He had the blessings of millowner like Birla and Goyanka on one hand on the other had political dacoits of Bihar like Suraj Narayan Singh, Yogendra Shukla, Gulati Sonar Busawan Singh were with him and Congress Socialist Party. Ganesh Dut also used to him. Swamiji presided over the proceeding on the second day at Bihar. Here there was an altercation on whether the colour of the peasant council should be red or tricolour. In 1937 session was held in Bachwada in Munger district which was presided by Pt. Yadunandan Sharma. Lakhs of farmers attended the session even after opposition from congress leadership. District Congress committee, district board, provincial board and Bihar's chief minister all forcefully passed a proposal that no congressmen shall attend the meeting of the peasant council (Kisan Sabha). However, the council session was held and it registered a huge participation. Same took place under the leadership of Pt. Yamuna Karyi. 6th peasant council was concluded in Darbhanga district in Vaaini. Volunteers in

* Jai Prakash Narayan was shadow of J.L. Nehru adventurer, general secretary of C.S.P. ultimately switched over to Gandhism.

red shirts reached there after walking 80 miles on bare foot. In June 1940 Karyanand Sharma was arrested during a struggle in Jamui peasant movement. Yadunandan Sharma and Indulal Yagik remained with Swamiji till the end. Indulal Yagik used to publish a fortnightly journal from Delhi named Kisan 'Bulletin'. In 1933 in Gaya there was a huge farmer protest. After hanging of Bhagat Singh, Baikunth Shukla murdered the informer Phanighosh in Betia. He was hanged in Gaya jail in 1933. Yogendra Shukla was jailed for two years in Bhagalpur. On 22nd June 1931 Chandra Shekhar Azad got martyred in Allahabad.

Govt. believed that Swami Sahajanand was only involved in resolving the valid complaints. In those days the pattern of his speeches also changed and he started providing creating ways of resolving peasant issues. This was a state when the peasant struggle was not fierce. In 1921 canal charges were 4 Rs. and 8 aane per acre while produce were sold in cheap rate. Recession fractured the economy of the peasants in the locality.

First provincial peasant session was held in Sonpur in 1929 and second in August 1930 in Gaya. In this Purshottam Das Tandon*, Abdul Gaffar Khan, Mohan Lal Gautam, Ramnandan Mishra and Yadunandan Sharma participated. In Bakthiyarpur an ashram was established with the efforts of Sheelbhadra Yaji. Swami Sahajanand, Ambika Kant and Shah Muhammad Munaini were present on the occasion. In Bihar the peasant struggle was much stable. Patna, Gaya and Munger were the center for the movement. In those days council was presented with issues related to price of sugarcane, labour charges, transport charges, canal charges and Zamindari exploitation.

* P. D. Tandon became President of Congress in 1947 defeating Kriplani. He opposed Gandhi on 15-16 June 1947 in the meeting of A.I.C.C. when Gandhi pleaded in favour of Partition. Gaffar Khan was top leader of Congress. He was from Peshawar.

Third session of Peasant meeting was held on 30-31 October in 1935 in which Swamiji and Benipuri participated. The meeting was presided by Ganga Sharan Singh. Swamiji suggested for continuous and organized movement so that facilities could be arranged for the peasants.

Third Bihar provincial peasant session was held on 26-27 November under the leadership of Swamiji in Hazipur.

Hilsa Thana peasant meeting was held on 6th December 1935. Bihata Sugar mill strike was on going in the same time. In January 1936. Swamiji and Yadunandan Sharma were working on farmer fronts in Ghosi, Arwal, Belaganj and Tekari. In Ekma a protest were staged on 27-28 march. Smt. Chandrawati, wife of Jagdish Prasad gave a phenomenal speech and also organized a separate meeting for women. Regional Officer of Aurangabad provided in his report:

Farmers finding committee has provoked anger in farmers and now they are participating in the movement with a greater spirit.

In this way the agitation turned out from calm to a much fierce state. Revolution which started with the demands of corrective actions now took a form against throwing out the landlord system and was headed towards the struggle. With fast changing circumstances, thoughts of Swami Sahajanand were also getting agitated. With the change in issues, programmes, rules and struggle, there was a phenomenal change across in his thinking.

Two day session on 7-8 November in 1936 in Bhagalpur, Bihpur was presided by Swamiji on the second day. Chief orator were Rambriksh Benipuri and Jai Prakash Narayan. Jai Prakash was also the President on the first day. Benipuri supported Swamiji on the demand of abolition of landlord system. Satya Narayan Singh, acting as the dictator of congress called the meeting as self-destructive and against national interests but

the other dictator Vinodanand Jha supported the cause of Swamiji. Congress didn't provided the support to the bill in the legislative assembly. Gandhites were pro-landlord.

Swamiji understood that peasant issues cannot be resolved through agreements and corrective actions. Due to his approach, a new council was formed within congress on 21st April 1934 and on 17th May 1934 Congress Socialist Party was established. Now peasant movement was directed towards becoming issue based struggle which was evident in Bihar in 1938-39. In 1936 Peasant council acknowledged Farm Labour as a part of peasant and started working towards their attainment and betterment. From 1938 onwards Khet Mazdoor (Farm Labour) and poor peasants were recognized as real peasant and Swamiji strived to fight for their cause on the basis of class struggle whereas Narendra Dev, Jai Prakash lent their support to rich and middle class peasants and bounded the struggle within the boundary approved by Gandhi. This led to parting of ways in 1939 in Gaya Session. But P.C. Joshi of C.P.I. anyhow managed to check the division for the time being. Congress socialists left Kisan Sabha in 1941 Dumaraon Session when Swamiji was in jail.

Weiner denoted Congress Socialist Party as:

Second line of defense of Indian Bourgeoisie.

Congress socialists ended with giving up the idea of that the state is an instrument of coercion and class domination. As such, they accepted the rules of the game of parliamentary polities based on castes and switched over to Gandhism ultimately. They always betrayed at critical hours as such in 1939 when real left were driven out from congress in 1939 and also in 1947 when power was transferred.

TIDE OF PEASANT REVOLUTION

By the passage of 1935 another important event took place in the history. Many prominent leader of communist and socialist gathered in Meerut and discussed on formation of an Organized Peasant Council also. N. G. Ranga, Swami Sahajanand Saraswati and Mohan Lal Gautam were the members of the council formed for this purpose. It was headed by Kamladevi Chatopadhyay on 16th January 1936. All famous socialist leaders across the nation participated in it.

On 11th April 1936 its session was conducted in Lucknow along with the session of congress. Pt. Nehru blessed the session. Swami Sahajanand Saraswati, Indulal Yagik, N. G. Ranga, Bankim Mukherjee, Z. A. Ahmed, Karyanand Sharma, Narendra Dev*, Avadheshwar Prasad Singh, Sharat Sinha, Vishnuram Medhi, Dinakar Mehta, Lal Bahadur Shastri, Sohan Singh Josh, Kamal Sarkar, K. D. Malviya and Mohan Lal Gautam were present in it.

(Source: History of Kisan Sabha, Author: Harkishan Singh Surjit)

This arrangement included leaders from Congress, Socialist communist party and arrangement continued for 5 years. C.P.I. was working in the garb of C.S.P. in 1936 by and large.

* Narendra Dev was head of C.S.P. He was more academic and Nehruites. He wanted Kisan Sabha under limit and boundary of Gandhism although he claimed to be Marxist. Indu Lal was from Gujarat loyal to Swamiji and was highly intellectuals.

OBJECTIVES OF PEASANT COUNCIL (KISAN SABHA)

1. To get rid of all forms of social exploitation.
2. Gaining total political rule for the peasant and labour and other exploited communities.
3. Winning complete freedom by participating in the national struggle and gaining financial and political control for the producers.

The objectives of All India Peasant Council were approved in Niyamatpur Ashram in Gaya on 14-15 July. Following objectives were declared in Komilla session:

“Peasant council aims to gain total political rule for the peasant and labour and other exploited communities, providing help to other political groups, especially the one involved in the freedom struggle so that a democratic government can be established wherein common people have participation with all financial and political rights.”

The political side was establishing the democratic rule. The driving force for it was daily struggle and uniting different forces for the national struggle. In the fourth session in Gaya a joint council between congress and peasant council was discussed so that people can be united against imperialism. The final motive was to establish a complete self-rule for the peasant union. Establishing a common union proved out to be a transactionary and ultimately deviation in the views of Swamiji and Narendra Dev, came to surface. Compromise Draft was prepared by P. C. Joshi. Later on Swamiji refused to accept that Gandhites congress was acting unitedly against the imperialism. He recognized the communist and the peasant council as the true united front. He had consensus with Subhash on this who was progressive nationalist socialist.

In Niyamatpur* session in 1937 red flag was finalised as

* Niyamatpur is situated near Belaganj station in between Gaya and Jahanabad.

84 | *Swami Sahajanand Saraswati*

the flag for Peasant council. It was also decided that peasant council shall follow tricolour for national struggle and red flag for the peasant struggle. Nehru and Narendra Dev wanted to keep tricolour flag for the peasant council. Decisions of Niyamatpur were noted in the Kolkata Session of All India Congress Committee on 27-28 October.

Swami Sahajanand said in the Komilla session in 1938 as a President of all India Kisan Sabha :

While Tricolour represents the nationalism, red flag represents the international unity and the desires of the exploited ones.

Yadunandan Sharma, being the member of reception committee said:

On one hand while it represents the national unity and national revolution, on the other hand it also represent international Unity and Social Revolution.

Rajendra Prasad, Ex-president of the congress said:

Gandhiji has said in the round table conference that congress is the peasant union.

Nehru Said:

Land problem is the biggest problem of the country. Farmers need to be united as an independent sect.

(N. N. Mitra—Indian Annual Register Page 203)

In December 1936 congress session was held in Faizpur. The second All India Kisan Sabha meeting was also organized here. Nehru was the President of Congress. Proposal was passed:

Congress knows that the biggest issue in the country is of farmers, unemployment and usurping. Congress believes

that this problem can be solved through the end of imperialism which is the source of exploitation of land arrangement and tax system."

All India Farming program was passed:

1. Fixation of tax and revenues
2. No taxes for less profitable farming
3. Fixation of farming taxes
4. Reducing the canal charges
5. Abolition of all Samanti, Levi and Forced Labour arrangements
6. Provisions of heirs to be introduced and the regions to be provided with rights of building houses and planting trees.
7. Efforts for governmental farming
8. Abolishing rural loan system.
9. Pending taxes from past to be done away.
10. Public grazing fields and public ponds to be provided.
11. Pending dues to be collected without interference
12. Favourable Environment to be developed for Farm Labour
13. Recognition of the Peasant councils.

Earst while president Nehruji* commented:

Participation of united farmers and labours shall only propel the fronts against Imperialism. We welcome this.

One objective of congress was to ensure participation of common public into the struggle so that the imperialists can be made to work on agreements. Uprooting the imperialism through struggle was not the core motive of congress. Swami Sahajanand

* Nehru was pseudo socialist. He posed as socialist to counter Gandhi and Patel in Congress politics. He used the Kisan Sabha to brow beat the Right wing of congress in tussle for Prime chair.

and Subhash Bose were aiming for complete independence. They did not recognize congress as the united front against the imperialism. Both were sentenced for working amongst the labour, students, youths and farmers. Congress also expelled them. Congress never talked about totally uprooting the imperialist in their Faizpur session. Congress didn't promoted sectional struggle fearing it would weaken the organization. Gandhiji wrote about the use of stick in English journal 'Harijan' aiming at two articles of Swamiji. Swamiji wrote as a reply:

Stick represents farmer's arm against the Landlord's exploitation.

Swamiji writes in his biography that farmers are non-violent by nature but he keeps stick while grazing cattle. He uses stick to kill the snake in case he meets one. Landlords are also like a snake. When landlord uses unfair means to exploit farmers and beat them then these people propagating non-violence turn blind. Farmers are struggling because of the financial and social circumstances. They want to get rid of it. Non-Violence provides a shield to landlord to exploit the farmers. Thus when farmers turn their sides then all parasites falls. Imperialist also bow down. This is the path of peasant upheaval, freedom and end of exploitation. Swamiji gained a practical approach for this while fighting against estates of Tekari, Sambhe and Dharhara. Sambhe Landlord and English collector of Gaya did not resisted and 1500 acre land was snatched away from farmers there. Swamiji was not in line with non-violence style of Gandhiji. Also he considered useless violence unnecessary. On it, being imperative Swamiji allowed use of stick and etc. He was a saint, shedding of blood was not acceptable to him. However, peasant sitting quieten was also not acceptable to him. He believed in uprising of the people. Whole section of peasant was feeling energetic. Swamiji said in Komilla session:

Peasant council wants uprooting of landlord system, not uprooting of landlords.

Yadunandan Sharma said as the head of reception committee in Gaya Session that peasant considers council's struggle a matter of policy and has open both thoughts for non-violence and violence. Meaning thereby that they oppose violence but will pursue it for the self-defence. Swamiji was in agreement with this. Subhash Chandra agreed with the statement of Tilak saying a trouble for the enemy is an opportunity for us. Swamiji taught same lesson to communist party in 1944-45 —“This is the opportunity, peasant council has to spread to villages and develop volunteers for self-defence because enemy is stuck in war”.

Indulal Yagik and Kamla Sharma worked on peasant council in Gujarat. Under Swamiji poor farmer's sects—Rani Paraja and Dubla protested with red flag in their hands in thousands. Nehru and Subhash welcomed this move. Tricolour and red flag were together in the Nagpur and Haripura meets in 1938.

Peasant council and Bihar congress had an altercation on the issue of “Kashtkari Proposal”. Congress under the pressure from landlords wanted to keep away this proposal which aimed at providing relief to farmers. On the contrary, they made changes in the proposal to nullify the clauses in the proposal, resulting in separation of Peasant Union from congress. Swamiji wrote two books in this regard to take side of peasants: “The other side of the shield” and Rent Reaction in Bihar: “How it works”. It exposed, how congress was cheating the farmers.

Jaiprakash also wrote in this context. Swamiji understood that without making changes in the basic structure, peasants cannot be pulled out of the pathetic situation. Imperialism only was not responsible for the pity state of farmers but also the pathetic state of the country. Zamindars were prop and stem.

Socialists like Narendra Dev believed that jihad against

landlords is counterviewing the national struggle. He wanted to keep it within the lines defined by congress. But Swamiji's and Subhash Bose's followers were not in agreement with this. They believed that this wave against the Landlords is a hit on Imperialism. On the contrary it is making the national struggle stronger by including more people in it. Broadening its social base; inducting new blood, new cadre in the struggle.

SWAMI SAID IN KOMILLA

“Congress's mentality is of introducing corrections, they fear revolutionary force”

In February 1938, peasant meeting was called in which few big farmers who were being supported by landlords were verbally abused. Swamiji was the spearhead of the peasant movement. Others included Indulal Yagnik, Jaiprakash, Bankim Chatterjee, Narendra Dev, Karyanand, Yadunandan Sharma and N. G. Ranga and Rahul Sankritayan.

N. G. Ranga, Narendra Dev and Jaiprakash were also involved in other Parties activities. But Swamiji dedicated whole of his time towards peasants. Thus it was natural that office was under him in Bihta. Peasant council was raised in each province. Swamiji travelled across the country and collected money and cadres for the council. He developed differences with the communist friends and congress socialists but donations from rich were not acceptable to him. He writes in his biography:

Resultant, on the path of self-dependence, I have been able to pull Indian peasant council.

In Bihar no congressmen opposed Gandhiji and Rajendra Prasad and Bihar was known as bonded province. But when Swamiji refused to collect donations from Bombay Seths, the tag of bonded province was removed from forehead of Bihar. Swamiji favoured thoughtfulness, not in ordering. He opposed Gandhi

and his associates for their dictat.

In Faizpur session, Nehru tacitly and tactfully agreed to continue programme for farmers. With efforts from Mahadev Vinayak Bhuskate, hundreds of farmers marched for miles in an army style to participate in the meeting. Nehru said few words and went away. This became a routing for the peasants who have walked for thousands of miles to hear them. Congress became powerful with the help of peasants but free tickets were not provided to farmers to participate in the Faizpur meet. Swamiji writes:

Rural Congress is working for whose benefit, was evident over there. It meant that congress was party of Zamindars and seth, sahukars not of common man.

In 1937, Congress won with majority with support of Swamiji and peasant council. Cruel landlord of Rewera lost to a simple candidate. Rajnridha Singh* also lost badly from Dharhara. Syamnandan Singh from congress won that seat. In this way money was beaten with the help of unity. Congress gave only few seats to peasant council members and did not provide adequate funds. However, peasant council supported congress inspite of this open treachery.

Swamiji wanted that there should be three tests to give a ticket to a candidate.

One who have suffered jails, and charges for the country. One who favours poor? Or one who is a member of Kisan Sabha.

Any one of the three was required. When his proposal was not accepted then he resigned from the post of member of Bihar Provincial working committee. Rajendra Babu could not sleep whole night in tension. He wrote a seven page letter to Swamiji. Swamiji replied:

* Rajnridha Singh was Zamindar of Dharhara Estate. He was Mayor of Patna Municipality. He was intimate to S.K. Singh, Chief Minister.

Your arguments will not have any impact on me. But if you think that my resignation will impact congress's success, so let me take it back.

Unwillingly Swamiji supported congress in the elections of 1937. Congress gave ticket to landlords and one who have never been to jail. Swamiji asked for vote for those people also and peasants agreed. Congress landlords won and became fiercer. Farmers cried in front of the council. Swamiji writes:

We committed this mistake of not contesting through independent farmer candidates.

In Mashrak provincial political meeting, Swamiji passed the proposal for ending landlord system without any compromise but the politicians never followed the proposal. Even ministers had agreements with landlords. Swamiji's soul cried out:

"How tactical, how much fake".

To stop peasant strike, tear gas and bullets were fired in Kanpur and Bombay. Labours in Jamshedpur, Jharia and Bihta were suppressed. Standing crops were snatched by landlords. Bills presented in the name of peasants were worded as such that they were in essence null and void. Wages for cutting the crop were kept unsolved. Swamiji wrote two books to unleash the truth:

"The other side of the shield"

"Rent reaction in Bihar—How it works".

No minister could answer even a single point raised in the book. On this matter Jai Prakash Narayan told many things to Rajendra Babu in a rejoinder.

Peasant council protested with 50000 peasants in Patna on 23rd august 1937. Farmers reached Legislative council. Neither the ministers came nor farmers were assured. Swamiji told in a warning tone in Gaya peasant meet:

If this attitude continues then results shall not be good.

Swamiji held a mass protest in Patna. Zamindar of Suryapura wrote a story "Daridra Narayan" on this. Chief Minister Shri Krishna Singh said "Swamiji, beware of this mob". Swamiji thought "there were days when they called these farmers a 'mass' and now they call it a 'mob' probably because they don't need them anymore."

Ministers and their accomplices forgot the farmers. In 1937 and 1938 many large protest rallies were held in Patna which saw participation from the corners of most parts. Farmers donated money for the collections. In 1937 Peasant demand day was celebrated across the state. In each assembly, peasants gathered in mass and celebrated with sounds and slogans. On 26th November 1937 second protest rally was held in Patna. Two protest were also held in Patna in 1938. One in summers and another one in monsoons. In summer session, Congressman Dr. Mehmood* also took part. On 15th July 1938, force was used to dissolve the protest by enforcing police act 144 but 50000 peasants could not be dispersed. Swamiji was the head. Protest marched to legislative assembly, high court and secretariat. There was a famous English writer as observer who came from Spain. He said at BHU meet which was noted by one of the audience:

We in Spain were happy to read news of such protest. Each protest helped farmers in Spain to rise up. This incident is mentioned in the biography of Swamiji 'Mera Jeevan Sangharsh. I was also present in the B.H.U. meeting and heard Mulk Raj Anand talk.

With increased power of peasants British were turning weak.

* Dr. Mehmood was class fellow of J.L. Nehru in England. He became Minister after 1937 election in Bihar. He was Nehru's choice for Chief Minister of Bihar in 1937 and 1946.

These protests were of international importance and its sound reverhrated everywhere.

Swamiji gave birth to Kisan Sabha in Kateya, Gopalganj and Siwan and developed them. Congressmen protested peasant councils but farmers on seeing Swamiji sat and listened to him. Swamiji didn't wanted that congress become weaker although there was a dispute between congress and peasant council. But circumstances were pushing towards it. In February 1938 meet, under the leadership of Rajendra Babu, regional congress passed a proposal of accusing Swamiji of spreading violence. This cleared his way. Swamiji resigned from the working committee.

Gandhiji wrote after his discussion with Mahadev Desai on this issue in his journal 'Harijan'.

Swamiji asked farmers to keep a stick for self-protection. Landlords used to beat farmers, Used to rape brides and daughters. Helpless farmer had not resort against them. In such circumstance, Swamiji asked them to keep a stick, for self-protection. This advice worked wonders for the farmers. Sitting dumb in the name of non-violence was not acceptable to Swamiji. Swamiji was a sage but now he developed the mastery over political and economic struggle also.

Barahiya taal struggle started from June 1938 and continued till mid-1939. Barahiya is in east of Patna to the south of Ganga. Landlords owned two types of land: Zeerat and Bakashat. Zeerat was with landlords since 1885. This was fixed. Remaining was Bakashat. Farmers who sowed Bakashat for 12 years were called Kaymi occupancy. Land obtained under the heir system was called maurusi. As per this act, bakashat owners were entitled for kaymi. However, landlords never gave the receipts. Rights to sow the land was not with the state but with landlord.

Farmers rose due to peasant movement. They understood their rights and asked for it. Direct struggle started under Karyanand Sharma. Armed policemen and landlords clashed

with the farmers but farmers could not be broken away. They were arrested and false cases were run against them. Sharma was imprisoned under act 19, 120b, 117 and 106 etc. peasant meeting were held again in May 1939, October 1938 in Munger, and February 1937 in Sheikhpura and October 1938 in Lakhipura. Panchanan Sharma from Lakhisarai led the march. He was beaten up in Barahiya. Many people sustained injuries. Along with Karyanand Sharma other labour leader Anil Mitra was also arrested. Yadunandan Sharma also reached Barahiya taal. Swamiji went their many times. Due to govt.'s policies and landlord's interruptions, justice could not be provided to the farmers over there. Thus farmers rose in a phenomenal way. Most of them were from backward community.

Yadunandan Sharma was in charge of the Revra Struggle. It is 8-10 miles south of Barsaliganj. Yadunandan Sharma used to train farmer volunteers. Jaiprakash was also one of them. On Swamiji's instance he was made member of the district congress committee. He was second leader from Revra. Labour leader Basavan Singh* was also ready with his front there. Landlord in Revra was Rameshwar Babu. 25000 farmers held the meeting. Women were sowing the field. Revra became a pilgrimage for farmers. When collector came, women moved forward in protest. Even on instance of landlord, collector acknowledging that this will invoke them did not give order to fire. Police returned and women continued sowing the field. Mostly they were Brahmin women. Brahmins never sowed the fields, this was against their caste practice but the scene in Revda was something else. Police was at loss in Revra. Earlier peasants were against landlords only and considered British as rulers but now they saw the truth. They understood that till the British are not thrown away, landlords shall continue to exploit. Now

* Basavan Singh was labour leader and an associate of famous revolutionary Yogendra Shukla.

peasant agitation was against the British across the country. Bihar's peasant struggle showed path to the whole nation.

Peasant struggle in Amwari was led by Rahul Sankartayanan, accompanied by Ram Briksh Brahmchari, Nagarajan* and Manjar Ali. Mahawat of Landlord Chandreshwar Singh broke Rahul's head by hit of a stick. In the same bleeding state he was sent to prison like a criminal. Nation was moved. Nehruji wrote in reply to Shri Krishna Singh. Swamiji burst into anger. These incidents increased the differences between the Kisan Sabha and congress. In Revra nearly 1500 acres land was occupied by Kisans.

In Kusumbha Taal, 1500 acre land near Badahtiya Taal was taken over by farmers. 85 per cent land in Khoda was also taken over by farmers and was approved by the collector. Women raised a slogan over here:

Long Live revolution. Let Landlord system end.

Similar protests were held in Gaya, Saran, Patna and Bhagalpur along with many other districts.

Swamiji felt disappointed that the center of communist party, Muzzafarpur does not have a representation from Peasant council. There was no existence of Peasant council there. Women in Majhiyava chased down the goons of Landlords. Battle in Dampura was won by women and children. They also led in Bhori and Turi villages. Daughter of Shaktibeejha, Rajkeshwardevi also participated who was married to Mahavir Singh of Sonadiha. She led the movement till end.

Under Ram Briksh Brahmachari's guidance, people led 14 miles march from Amwari to Siwan. This was phenomenal success. He was from Samvalpur and they fasted for 70 days

* Nagarjan was scholar activist of Kisan Sabha and follower of Rahul. Manjar Ali was son of Mazahrul Hazue famous congress-league leader. He joined C.P.I. through Kisan movement of Ambari in Siwan district.

for the protest. Swamiji was proud of such accomplice.

During these struggles around 2000 men, women and children were jailed. Many of them were beaten too and some even died but farmers continued the struggle. The bravery portrayed by farmers was not visible elsewhere. Swamiji concluded:

Normally we should not get into a dispute after a fight, even if we might lose. In such circumstances, even a defeat is gainful because we get insight into our weakness. I have also observed that if work is pursued with faith then even lack of funds, men and food cannot be a hindrance. This is our mistake to think that we can win with other's fund and men. That victory in my view is like a defeat because farmers shall not become self-dependent. Their rights shall be snatched and others will be empowered. (Mera Jeevan Sangharsh)

In 1938, Swamiji made first visit to Gujarat. He walked along the congressmen from Haripura-Indulal Yagik and his accomplices showed immense enthusiasm and bravery. Almost 25000 farmers participated. Speeches were held in evening. In Bardoli struggle only 10-15 per cent Patel participated. However farmers in Gujarat were Rani Purja, Dubla and Haali. Their land was snatched away. They were highly exploited. No one paid attention towards them. Subhash Babu was the Head in Haripura Congress, he was greatly supported by farmers. Subhash Bose was re-elected on the support of the peasants, he said in this speech in 1938:

Congressmen should consider all those engaged in independence struggle as the source of power.

With Gandhiji's blessings, Pattabhi Sitaramaiya stood against Subhash in Tripuri congress but he lost. In 1939, Subhash Bose

peasant agitation was against the British across the country. Bihar's peasant struggle showed path to the whole nation.

Peasant struggle in Amwari was led by Rahul Sankartayanan, accompanied by Ram Briksh Brahmchari, Nagarajan* and Manjar Ali. Mahawat of Landlord Chandreshwar Singh broke Rahul's head by hit of a stick. In the same bleeding state he was sent to prison like a criminal. Nation was moved. Nehruji wrote in reply to Shri Krishna Singh. Swamiji burst into anger. These incidents increased the differences between the Kisan Sabha and congress. In Revra nearly 1500 acres land was occupied by Kisans.

In Kusumbha Taal, 1500 acre land near BadahtiyaTaal was taken over by farmers. 85 per cent land in Khoda was also taken over by farmers and was approved by the collector. Women raised a slogan over here:

Long Live revolution. Let Landlord system end.

Similar protests were held in Gaya, Saran, Patna and Bhagalpur along with many other districts.

Swamiji felt disappointed that the center of communist party, Muzzafarpur does not has a representation from Peasant council. There was no existence of Peasant council there. Women in Majhiyava chased down the goons of Landlords. Battle in Dampura was won by women and children. They also led in Bhor and Turi villages. Daughter of Shaktibeegha, Rajkeshwardevi also participated who was married to Mahavir Singh of Sonadiha. She led the movement till end.

Under Ram Briksh Brahmachari's guidance, people led 14 miles march from Amwari to Siwan. This was phenomenal success. He was from Samvalpur and they fasted for 70 days

* Nagarjan was scholar activist of Kisan Sabha and follower of Rahul. Manjar Ali was son of Mazahrul Hazue famous congress-league leader. He joined C.P.I. through Kisan movement of Ambari in Siwan district.

for the protest. Swamiji was proud of such accomplice.

During these struggles around 2000 men, women and children were jailed. Many of them were beaten too and some even died but farmers continued the struggle. The bravery portrayed by farmers was not visible elsewhere. Swamiji concluded:

Normally we should not get into a dispute after a fight, even if we might lose. In such circumstances, even a defeat is gainful because we get insight into our weakness. I have also observed that if work is pursued with faith then even lack of funds, men and food cannot be a hindrance. This is our mistake to think that we can win with other's fund and men. That victory in my view is like a defeat because farmers shall not become self-dependent. Their rights shall be snatched and others will be empowered. (Mera Jeevan Sangharsh)

In 1938, Swamiji made first visit to Gujrat. He walked along the congressmen from Haripura-Indulal Yagik and his accomplices showed immense enthusiasm and bravery. Almost 25000 farmers participated. Speeches were held in evening. In Bardoli struggle only 10-15 per cent Patel participated. However farmers in Gujrat were Rani Purja, Dubla and Haali. Their land was snatched away. They were highly exploited. No one paid attention towards them. Subhash Babu was the Head in Haripura Congress, he was greatly supported by farmers. Subhash Bose was re-elected on the support of the peasants, he said in this speech in 1938:

Congressmen should consider all those engaged in independence struggle as the source of power.

With Gandhiji's blessings, Pattabhi Sitaramaiya stood against Subhash in Tripuri congress but he lost. In 1939, Subhash Bose

peasant agitation was against the British across the country. Bihar's peasant struggle showed path to the whole nation.

Peasant struggle in Amwari was led by Rahul Sankartayanan, accompanied by Ram Briksh Brahmchari, Nagarajan* and Manjar Ali. Mahawat of Landlord Chandreshwar Singh broke Rahul's head by hit of a stick. In the same bleeding state he was sent to prison like a criminal. Nation was moved. Nehruji wrote in reply to Shri Krishna Singh. Swamiji burst into anger. These incidents increased the differences between the Kisan Sabha and congress. In Revra nearly 1500 acres land was occupied by Kisans.

In Kusumbha Taal, 1500 acre land near Badahtiya Taal was taken over by farmers. 85 per cent land in Khoda was also taken over by farmers and was approved by the collector. Women raised a slogan over here:

Long Live revolution. Let Landlord system end.

Similar protests were held in Gaya, Saran, Patna and Bhagalpur along with many other districts.

Swamiji felt disappointed that the center of communist party, Muzzafarpur does not have a representation from Peasant council. There was no existence of Peasant council there. Women in Majhiyava chased down the goons of Landlords. Battle in Dampura was won by women and children. They also led in Bhori and Turi villages. Daughter of Shaktibeejha, Rajkeshwardevi also participated who was married to Mahavir Singh of Sonadiha. She led the movement till end.

Under Ram Briksh Brahmachari's guidance, people led 14 miles march from Amwari to Siwan. This was phenomenal success. He was from Samvalpur and they fasted for 70 days

* Nagarjan was scholar activist of Kisan Sabha and follower of Rahul. Manjar Ali was son of Mazahrul Hazue famous congress-league leader. He joined C.P.I. through Kisan movement of Ambari in Siwan district.

for the protest. Swamiji was proud of such accomplice.

During these struggles around 2000 men, women and children were jailed. Many of them were beaten too and some even died but farmers continued the struggle. The bravery portrayed by farmers was not visible elsewhere. Swamiji concluded:

Normally we should not get into a dispute after a fight, even if we might lose. In such circumstances, even a defeat is gainful because we get insight into our weakness. I have also observed that if work is pursued with faith then even lack of funds, men and food cannot be a hindrance. This is our mistake to think that we can win with other's fund and men. That victory in my view is like a defeat because farmers shall not become self-dependent. Their rights shall be snatched and others will be empowered. (Mera Jeevan Sangharsh)

In 1938, Swamiji made first visit to Gujrat. He walked along the congressmen from Haripura-Indulal Yagik and his accomplices showed immense enthusiasm and bravery. Almost 25000 farmers participated. Speeches were held in evening. In Bardoli struggle only 10-15 per cent Patel participated. However farmers in Gujrat were Rani Purja, Dubla and Haali. Their land was snatched away. They were highly exploited. No one paid attention towards them. Subhash Babu was the Head in Haripura Congress, he was greatly supported by farmers. Subhash Bose was re-elected on the support of the peasants, he said in this speech in 1938:

Congressmen should consider all those engaged in independence struggle as the source of power.

With Gandhiji's blessings, Pattabhi Sitaramaiya stood against Subhash in Tripuri congress but he lost. In 1939, Subhash Bose

peasant agitation was against the British across the country. Bihar's peasant struggle showed path to the whole nation.

Peasant struggle in Amwari was led by Rahul Sankartayanan, accompanied by Ram Briksh Brahmchari, Nagarajan* and Manjar Ali. Mahawat of Landlord Chandreshwar Singh broke Rahul's head by hit of a stick. In the same bleeding state he was sent to prison like a criminal. Nation was moved. Nehruji wrote in reply to Shri Krishna Singh. Swamiji burst into anger. These incidents increased the differences between the Kisan Sabha and congress. In Revra nearly 1500 acres land was occupied by Kisans.

In Kusumbha Taal, 1500 acre land near Badahtiya Taal was taken over by farmers. 85 per cent land in Khoda was also taken over by farmers and was approved by the collector. Women raised a slogan over here:

Long Live revolution. Let Landlord system end.

Similar protests were held in Gaya, Saran, Patna and Bhagalpur along with many other districts.

Swamiji felt disappointed that the center of communist party, Muzzafarpur does not have a representation from Peasant council. There was no existence of Peasant council there. Women in Majhiyava chased down the goons of Landlords. Battle in Dampura was won by women and children. They also led in Bhor and Turi villages. Daughter of Shaktibeequa, Rajkeshwardevi also participated who was married to Mahavir Singh of Sonadiha. She led the movement till end.

Under Ram Briksh Brahmachari's guidance, people led 14 miles march from Amwari to Siwan. This was phenomenal success. He was from Samvalpur and they fasted for 70 days

* Nagarjan was scholar activist of Kisan Sabha and follower of Rahul. Manjar Ali was son of Mazahrul Hazue famous congress-league leader. He joined C.P.I. through Kisan movement of Ambari in Siwan district.

for the protest. Swamiji was proud of such accomplice.

During these struggles around 2000 men, women and children were jailed. Many of them were beaten too and some even died but farmers continued the struggle. The bravery portrayed by farmers was not visible elsewhere. Swamiji concluded:

Normally we should not get into a dispute after a fight, even if we might lose. In such circumstances, even a defeat is gainful because we get insight into our weakness. I have also observed that if work is pursued with faith then even lack of funds, men and food cannot be a hindrance. This is our mistake to think that we can win with other's fund and men. That victory in my view is like a defeat because farmers shall not become self-dependent. Their rights shall be snatched and others will be empowered. (Mera Jeevan Sangharsh)

In 1938, Swamiji made first visit to Gujrat. He walked along the congressmen from Haripura-Indulal Yagik and his accomplices showed immense enthusiasm and bravery. Almost 25000 farmers participated. Speeches were held in evening. In Bardoli struggle only 10-15 per cent Patel participated. However farmers in Gujrat were Rani Purja, Dubla and Haali. Their land was snatched away. They were highly exploited. No one paid attention towards them. Subhash Babu was the Head in Haripura Congress, he was greatly supported by farmers. Subhash Bose was re-elected on the support of the peasants, he said in this speech in 1938:

Congressmen should consider all those engaged in independence struggle as the source of power.

With Gandhiji's blessings, Pattabhi Sitaramaiya stood against Subhash in Tripuri congress but he lost. In 1939, Subhash Bose

peasant agitation was against the British across the country. Bihar's peasant struggle showed path to the whole nation.

Peasant struggle in Amwari was led by Rahul Sankartayanan, accompanied by Ram Briksh Brahmchari, Nagarajan* and Manjar Ali. Mahawat of Landlord Chandreshwar Singh broke Rahul's head by hit of a stick. In the same bleeding state he was sent to prison like a criminal. Nation was moved. Nehruji wrote in reply to Shri Krishna Singh. Swamiji burst into anger. These incidents increased the differences between the Kisan Sabha and congress. In Revra nearly 1500 acres land was occupied by Kisans.

In Kusumba Taal, 1500 acre land near Badahtiya Taal was taken over by farmers. 85 per cent land in Khoda was also taken over by farmers and was approved by the collector. Women raised a slogan over here:

Long Live revolution. Let Landlord system end.

Similar protests were held in Gaya, Saran, Patna and Bhagalpur along with many other districts.

Swamiji felt disappointed that the center of communist party, Muzzafarpur does not have a representation from Peasant council. There was no existence of Peasant council there. Women in Majhiyava chased down the goons of Landlords. Battle in Dampura was won by women and children. They also led in Bhor and Turi villages. Daughter of Shaktibeequa, Rajkeshwardevi also participated who was married to Mahavir Singh of Sonadiha. She led the movement till end.

Under Ram Briksh Brahmachari's guidance, people led 14 miles march from Amwari to Siwan. This was phenomenal success. He was from Samvalpur and they fasted for 70 days

* Nagarjan was scholar activist of Kisan Sabha and follower of Rahul. Manjar Ali was son of Mazahrul Hazue famous congress-league leader. He joined C.P.I. through Kisan movement of Ambari in Siwan district.

for the protest. Swamiji was proud of such accomplice.

During these struggles around 2000 men, women and children were jailed. Many of them were beaten too and some even died but farmers continued the struggle. The bravery portrayed by farmers was not visible elsewhere. Swamiji concluded:

Normally we should not get into a dispute after a fight, even if we might lose. In such circumstances, even a defeat is gainful because we get insight into our weakness. I have also observed that if work is pursued with faith then even lack of funds, men and food cannot be a hindrance. This is our mistake to think that we can win with other's fund and men. That victory in my view is like a defeat because farmers shall not become self-dependent. Their rights shall be snatched and others will be empowered. (Mera Jeevan Sangharsh)

In 1938, Swamiji made first visit to Gujarat. He walked along the congressmen from Haripura-Indulal Yagik and his accomplices showed immense enthusiasm and bravery. Almost 25000 farmers participated. Speeches were held in evening. In Bardoli struggle only 10-15 per cent Patel participated. However farmers in Gujarat were Rani Purja, Dubla and Haali. Their land was snatched away. They were highly exploited. No one paid attention towards them. Subhash Babu was the Head in Haripura Congress, he was greatly supported by farmers. Subhash Bose was re-elected on the support of the peasants, he said in this speech in 1938:

Congressmen should consider all those engaged in independence struggle as the source of power.

With Gandhiji's blessings, Pattabhi Sitaramaiya stood against Subhash in Tripuri congress but he lost. In 1939, Subhash Bose

was expelled from Congress, in Wardha. He said:

I warned the country not to continue on the path of reformative corrective action method. I opposed congress's proposals demolishing revolutionary feelings. I further tried to unite communists and warned against the forthcoming danger. This is what I have been punished for.

(Diamond Pocket Book, Revolutionary Subhash, Page 75)

Swamiji fully supported Subhash in the struggle against Imperialism. He too was expelled from Congress for 6 years. Expelling a person elected by defined rules itself was wrong. Swamiji, like Subhash understood that:

This was the most appropriate time to launch agitation against govt. British were engaged in 2nd world war. So, surely it was the best opportunity to overthrow it.

Gandhiji and Nehruji could not recognize the appropriate time for struggle between 1939 and 1942. 'Quit India' movement was launched by Subhash and Swamiji on 19th March 1940 in Ramgarh. Gandhiji appeared in the same on 9th August 1942 in Mumbai belately and temporarily.

In 1939 in Gaya almost 1.25 Lakhs farmers came to the Kisan Sabha session. Narendra Dev was the chief, accompanied by Purshottam Das Tandon, Abdul Gaffer Khan, Mohan Lal, Jaiprakash Narayan and P. C. Joshi. 5th session was held in 1940 in Pallasa near Vishakhapatnam. Rahul Kataynana was elected chief over here. Swamiji and Subhash were imprisoned for their slogans "Kick-out British" and "Give us death or freedom". Rahul's speech was read out as he was under arrest. After this session, Ranga was also arrested. Swamiji was arrested on 19th April 1940 and was sentenced for three years. Shyam Sundar Das of Palasa died in jail while under the shadowing glooming imprisonment.

Peasant council was weak in Tamil Nadu, Mahakoushal, Maharashtra, Sindh and Assam. Sikander Hayat Khan of Unionist Party in Punjab banned Swamiji's meetings. Swamiji held meetings with Harshdev Malviya in Awadh. He went to Gwalpada in Assam in February 1940 and headed the peasant council there. He also toured Utkal. He also participated in Peasant meetings in Brar, Maharashtra, Marathi, Madhyant and Mahakoushal. In Utkal in 1939 he re-energised the peasant council. Swamiji noticed that farmers are ready all around with energy, confidence and faith with the workers. He was surprised in those days:

Peasant council's work is done by more communist people more actively than that of communist party. I cannot explain the reason.

Subhash clearly supported peasants from Gandhiji's and Vallabh Bhai Patel's regions and held a show of power in front of all progressive thinkers. Subhash's victory was not likened by many leaders in the country.

There Swamiji developed differences with Jaiprakash Narayan. Jaiprakash represented himself as the younger brother of Nehru against Subhash. Till now Jaiprakash was amongst Swamiji's favourites. He helped him in reaching national level from district level. That was a pitiful situation. Communists were breaking away, communist union was Swamiji's dream. He wrote:

Members of one communist party distrusted the members of other communist party a lot.

Swamiji tried that all progressive thinkers should sit together to develop a strategy but failed. He was hurt and thus he did

* Harshdev Malviya, K.D. Malviya, P.K. Malviya associates of Swamiji all were from Madan Mohan Malviya family who was four times President of Congress and President of Hindu Mahasabha too.

not join any political party after being expelled from congress.

But yet he considered Subhash as most appropriate for left united front. His thought were supported by M. N. Rai, Jaiprakash and P. C. Joshi. In 1939 June with efforts of Nariman and Swamiji's support, a united left consolidation committee. was formed at Subhash's residence in Kolkata but when congress passed the proposal saying that no satyagrah should be held without regional congress party's approvals then it was decided to celebrate 9th July 1939 as the protest day. M. N. Rai* and Jaiprakash didn't participated in fear of disciplinary action by congress. In future Subhash and Swamiji raised the movement against imperialism. Jaiprakash didn't even came to Nagpur meet. On 11-12 October communist friends were not ready to continue in left front. Swamiji wrote:

In a long letter to the members, I ended my relations with them. Reasons were mentioned in the letter.

All farmers were required to pay fee of 1 paisa to become member. Village Kisan Sabha elected members for Thana. Members from Thana elected representatives for the district. District representatives choose provincial representatives. There were 15 members in provincial council. There was one chief, one dy. chief and two councillors. Elections were held once in a year and treasurer were elected for long terms. Membership of Bihar provincial peasant council was 80000 in 1935 which rose to 250000 in 1938. It was largest council membership across India.

Swamiji enlightened farmers collectively against their social state. They developed them for the change and invoked faith. He first created situation for the movement and then took it to the highest level.

* M. N. Roy was founder of C.P.I. in 1920 at Tashkant. In 1940 all the three Roy, J.P. and Joshi left the left united front and sided with Gandhi.

Swamiji wrote to P. C. Joshi:

We cannot do anything without few Block and platforms. I discussed this with comrade Mohan Lal Gautam in Kolkata in presence of Jaiprakash. They could not persuade me. If we shall hesitate to support in such correct task then we might fail to provide support to Mr. Bose and thus hopes across the nation will fall—this is what I believe. Future generation will curse us for losing the chance provided by Subhash Bose. This situation is giving me immense pain. And these communists are cursing Subhash instead of praising him and accusing him of breaking the rules. (Dr. Walter Hauser)

Swamiji gained huge acceptance across the nation on the basis of his ability to experiment. He by raising the slogans against the imperialism continuously kept communist on his side. Congress socialists were getting uneasy whether to join congress or the communist party. In 1945 the membership of Peasant union was 825000 inspite of C.S.P. deserting it.

Swamiji wrote in book "Khet Mazdoor":

"Peasant council is for all such exploited humans who are related to farming and earn their livelihood through this. The more they are exploited more they are dearer to peasant council. No divide lines can be drawn between farmers and farm labours. Thus it is suitable that farm labour should be considered as farmer itself and should be aligned with farmer in their efforts".

During the early movements, even small landlords were defined as farmers. Big farmers continues to take part in the struggle but Swamiji's hope were dependent on small, exploited farmers and farm labours. In 1944 in Baijwada session, big farmers left the council completely. Medium scale farmers continued. Most exploited and ruined farmers were recognized as the real farmers and were considered as the main source of

the revolution. It was expected that this section of farmers, along with labour council shall lead the revolution. But the freedom of peasant council was not acceptable to the communist party which became the reason for differences. Swamiji continuously resisted the efforts of Congress, congress Socialist and Communist Parties to act as big brother to the peasant council. He was against the policy of supremacy. He welcomed all the communists and efficient forces in the peasant council so that the front against the imperialism does not become week. Making peasant council as a congregation of a particular party was wrong in his views.

A summary of his thoughts in his own words:

I do favour to provide the ruling authority in hands of working public by taking it from others. However I oppose the move of taking it away from others through conciliation. We will have to fight to gain it. Then only we shall be able to sustain it. If it is received with ease, it shall be again snatched away. This is the truth and I am devoted towards fulfilling my dream. For this we need to prepare a group of workers and leaders. For this we need to prepare strong activists and need to prepare a group of new leaders. But those who are not a part of economic programmes for farmers and labours and are not working towards uniting them towards the struggle they cannot be our leader or activists. I don't want bookish knowledge. Only bookish knowledge leads to unfaithfulness. I want a struggle and strugglers. I oppose freedom struggle without any economic struggle. I want economic and political revolution and this cannot happen in any other way. I will anyway support those people but after being bored of the party based politics I fear joining any political party. Neither will I allow anyone to join.

Political Parties wanted to treat Kisan Sabha as their mass organization. Swamiji opposed the concept. He wanted Kisan Sabha as free and independent class organization of peasants. These were his thoughts on the political and economic revolution. He was against transfer of rule, he wanted to have the rule through capture itself. He supported struggle over agreements. His ultimate objective was to indulge in politics but not through rebellion but through uprising of common people engaged in struggle and uniting their efforts. He was not merely a radical person but was a peasant revolutionary. He writes “nowadays politics has become scientific and visionary. Thus it requires observation. This can cause us illusion but still all are focused on charkha. This is the result of underdevelopment of understanding. Our country is full of dumb people who sacrifice their lives for superstitions and thus lose all their wealth, image and dharma. In a country where illiterate and priests, gurus and ulemas are made responsible for things, only god can save such nation.”

Swamiji had huge differences with the reformists. Every party thought that only they can show the correct path to the nation. Similar things were said by religious people for redemption. Swamiji was hurt by this fact that religious organizations used to abuse each other, like political parties, and used to proclaim that the members of other groups are traitors. Swamiji writes:

“I consider this utter foolishness wherein a patriot person is considered traitor on joining other party. If I am angry on parties then there is a big reason for it. Today I consider the leaders and parties as patriots and on joining any other party shall commit foolishness of calling them traitors. This colourful vision is very dangerous. Parties destroy personal understanding and personality. We join a party and lose our freedom while our first goal is achieving independence.”

Swamiji was republican. He acknowledged the importance of democracy. He was a follower of unity of progressive left. However personal freedom was dear to him. He writes:

Destroying my personal freedom for the sake of a party, a small person like me cannot commit such a mammoth task. Should we kill our personal freedom, freedom which we are fighting for? Should we transform ourselves into machines? I searched all around but could not find it; and if found would have not accepted. I acknowledge that without limiting personal freedom to a certain extent a union cannot function but I acknowledge this fact also that is applicable for the detailing and should happen also. Personal freedom should be there for the principles. It is a different matter that we might not oppose the different stand of party on the issues, especially in the cases of historical importance or war fronts when the matter is of life and death. We may express our view but not indulge in active opposition, this is understandable. But killing the thought all together is a dangerous situation.

Swamiji was Marxit but did not believe in dictatorship of one class. It is clear that Swamiji was ready to sacrifice personal freedom for social freedom but not destroying it. Swamiji favoured personal freedom and cultural identity along with social needs and responsibilities. On this issue he continuously fought with congress socialists in 1938 in Komilla session and with communist parties in 1943. When Kishori Prassan Singh and Karyanand Sharma resigned from the Socialist party, there was upheaval in Hazaribagh. It became difficult for Swamiji to even move out from prison's cell. He writes:

I shall never forget the actions of the parties in the jail, especially of one particular party which were highly

annoying. They have left no means, to increase the membership and make life difficult for those who are not joining. They were threatening and beating people. They polluted the atmosphere of the prison.

He was mentioning about C.S.P. and its leader J.P. When Kishori Prassan Singh joined communist party in devli camp during Second World War, then Jaiprakash received information about it in Hazaribagh jail. He requested through his letter:

Inform our accomplices in Bihar about Kishori's trait.

(Rakesh Gupta—Bihar peasantry and the Kishan Sabha, PPH Publications, Page 120)

Karyanand Sharma was in Hazaribagh Jail. There he came in contact with Rahul Sankartayanan, Sunil Mukherjee and Vinod Mukherjee. On Swamiji's advice he joined communist party from jail itself in 1940.

In this way, thought based struggle going on within the peasant council badly affected the relations of Swamiji, Subhash Bose, Jaiprakash, M. N. Rai and P. C. Joshi. This created disturbance in the peasant council. In 1941, Forward Block separated itself from the peasant council. In Bejwada session, Swamiji developed differences with communist party. Communist party was supporting Pakistani and wanted to control Peasant council. Swamiji didn't participated in the 1945 Netrakona peasant council even after visiting the Maimon Singh District* headquarter. He disclosed his displeasure in a student gathering in Maimon Singh. Swamiji, Yadunandan Sharma and Indulal Yagik were on same conclusion at that time. N. G. Ranga separated from Swamiji in 1943. He was complaining about

* Maimon Singh is situated in East Bengal, now in Bangladesh. Netrakona is near by Swamiji hear expressed his anger on communist party's stand on war against imperialism which was kept by them in abeyance and instead they indulged in grow more food campaign suited to British.

the increased influence of communist party on the peasant council, which Swamiji was facing and bearing. This situation was unbearable for Swamiji. As the Peasant council was gaining acceptance from the lower sections of the society, middle and large scale farmers were moving out of the council. Exploited people were uniting but the structure of the peasant council was still old, while thoughts were aggressive. Being in jail and untimely death, Swamiji could not revive the structure. This became the reason for peasant council's stagnation in future. Diversion of cadres was the epicentre and it took time to motivate the new cadre. Middle class, attracted by constitutional politics got segregated from the peasant council. Price rise and chances of demolishing of land lordship made larger farmers to move away. They were now interested in participating in the govt. Dr Shri Krishna got the rule. Though he was from rich peasantry he succeeded in implementing few policies for farmers but govt. was actually controlled by touts and corrupt bureaucrats. In time Socialist party got dissolved. Reasons were lack of revolutionary theme, lack of cadres, presence of opportunists and wealthy. This estimation is of famous socialist Madhudandbati in '50 years of socialism' and resembles truth.

Dr. Shri Krishna Singh should be credited for making Damodar Valley plan, based on Tennessee valley plan of America, wherein public welfare was kept on priority. Rising above the local politics, he freed Bengal from Malaria and flood. Provided Bihar-Bengal with hydel electricity and organized for irrigation facilities in Bengal. Although he was prozamindar he was nationalist too.

In his reign dams were constructed in Mayurakshi, Badua, Gatalsood, Kharagpur and Tenughat. Barrage was constructed on Ganga-Kosi. This was a unique project in the country. Inspired by it dams were constructed in Tillaia, Panchet, Maithon, Baansi and Konar etc. Country's first manure factory

was set up in Sindri and industrialised a backward region like Barauni by constructing embankment on river Ganga. This was an impossible task. Due to lack of funds for small enterprises and lack of work culture, industrialization of Bihar suffered. Over the period of time, those class, producing wealth started to decline and those involved in mischiefs became happier. In a stagnant society, even Jaiprakash's ashram existed just for namesake only. Efforts in uprising all the sections were unsuccessful. C.S.P. and J.P. has deserted Kisan Sabha in 1941 and never returned to Kisan Politics and class struggle for their emancipation and liberation.

LUCKNOW SESSION

First session of All India Peasant Council was held on 11th April 1936 in Lucknow. Swami Sahajanand Saraswati, Indulal Yagik, N. C. Ranga, Karyanand Sharma, Sohan Singh Josh, Kamal Sarkar, Kunwar Ashraf, Ram Manohar Lohiya and Mohan Lal Gautam were present in it. Swamiji said:

There cannot be any agreement between farmers and landlords until zamindari system is abolished. Zamindari system is the root of all evils. Without uprooting Zamindari, welfare of famers is not possible.

He was made founder President of All India Kisan Sabha.

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohiya said:

Gandhiji has issues of farmers only for relief from land revenue but he is not in agreement on issues of relief between farmers and Zamindari. Zamindars in Bengal receive 18 crores as land revenue from farmers while govt. gets only 3 crores. This justifies that farmers can be relieved only by uprooting Zamindari system and for this purpose Peasant council has been formed.

Sohan Singh Josh cleared:

For abolishing Zamindari system it is necessary to uproot imperialism which is protecting Zamindari system.

Erstwhile Congress President, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru greeted the people who came to participate in this meet. Formation of peasant union gave a spirit of hope and enthusiasm across the nation. It became active in different parts of the country. Farmers were burdened under the loans. They were full of anger against Zamindars and interest charging traders and usurpers. Due to Gaddari Baba Karam Singh Cheema's efforts, unionist party was forced to pass a law to end the loans across Punjab within one year. This loan ending struggle proved to be the start point for the Peasant revolution in Punjab. Lots of struggle took place in Bihar. Bengal's Tebhaga struggle, surma valley struggle, barli struggle, jhummiyas struggle of Tripura, Telangana struggle of Andhra and Punnappa struggle of Kerala are some famous peasant struggles.

This peasant revolution created a wave which forced imperialist to bow down and forced congress to introduce land reform laws after independence, however it kept open other options also. This is indeed horrible that even after 68 years of freedom, the state of farmers is pathetic. In 1936 struggle the financial state of the farmers was very bad. Farmers were at unease which naturally resulted in revolutionary movements. Rural offices were shut down, impact of recession was ubiquitous. In such circumstances, Swamiji formed Peasant council. A section in country wanted that Zamindari system should end and British rule should end so that the wealth they have kept stored can be invested in the market, leading to increase in trade opportunities. For this a large section of Congress socialists were being supported by TATA, Birla and Bajaj. Few nationalist farmers also entered with pure intentions.

Sohan Singh Bhakhna¹, Jwala Singh, Baba Aruadh Singh, Baba Satta Singh and Gandiwid of Gadar party also joined. Few other think tanks like Indulal Yagik and Kunwar Ashraf Ali² also joined. Few poor farmers like Karyanand Sharma and Yadunandan Sharma also took part. Few foreign returned, in their thrust for power also participated. Largest portion was of poor farmers who were being exploited by the Zamindars. In the proposal passed in the Lucknow, 'Freedom of farmers from all sorts of exploitations' was decided as the objective. Peasant council is dedicated to provide full financial and political control in hands of farmers, this was announced. Swamiji's dedicated and struggling nature, made all this possible.

FAIZPUR SESSION

This session was concluded on 25-26th December 1936. 500 farmers holding red flags in their hands under the leadership of B. S. Bhuskate and J. Bukhari marched 200 miles from Mansad from 12th December to reach Faizpur on 25th December. They were received by Pt. Nehru, Swami Sahajanand, Shankar Rao Dev, M. N. Rai, Mani Ben Mulji, Narendra Dev, N. C. Ranga, Indulal Yagik³, Jaiprakash Narayana, Bankim Mukherjee, Shivnath Banerjee, M. R. Masani, Yusuf Mehra Ali etc. belonging to congress, C.S.P. and labour leaders. Subhash Chandra Bose said:

I am pleased to see congress marching for peasants. This march shall make farmers on their way aware of the issues. He wished for the success of peasant congress. Shankar Dev Rao was the chief of reception committee from congress.

1. Sohan Singh Bhakhana was leader of revolutionary Gaddar Party, had joined Kisan Sabha and C.P.I.
2. Ashraf Ali was founder of All India Student Federation.
3. Indulal Yagik, Was one of closest leader of Kisan Sabha, loyal to Swamiji. He was England return intellectual, editor of Kisan Buletin and organ of Kisan Sabha, nearer to Marxism and Staunch nationalist as well.

Bhuskate was the head of local peasant council. He said: Our compromise less struggle involving farmers and workers working together shall aim for formation of union for peasant revolution and Independence of the country.

Chief of the meeting called out famers and labours for formation of socialist rule. He congratulated Pt. Nehru for being re-elected on his own and peasant council's behalf. In this session a meet was organized on 26th December involving 15000 farmers. Indulal Yagik, Bankim Mukherjee and B. P. L. Vedi were appointed joint secretaries. Forgiving revenue against unauthorized sowing was demanded. Further emphasis was laid on abolishing levy, forced labour, recovery of due amounts etc.

MEETING IN NIYAMATPUR

All India Peasant councils meet in Gaya district at Niyamatpur concluded on 14th July 1937. In this meet, red flag was adopted as peasant union's symbol. This decision was approved in Albert Hall in Kolkata on 27-28 October 1937, hosted by Ambika Singh.

MEETING IN KOLKATA

A rally was organized which was headed by Subhash Chandra Bose.

MEETING IN HARIPURA

Subhash Chandra Bose pioneer of economic and political planning of India laid the Foundation of planning in India at Haripura session in 1938.

All India Peasant council meeting concluded on 26-29 February 1938 in Haripura. Swamiji, Indulal Yagik and Sumant Mehta organized a route march. It was decided to celebrate 1st September as the Peasant day. To establish a farmer-labour rule in the country it was also decided to celebrate Labour

Day. An appeal was made by Jaiprakash Narayan and P. C. Joshi to celebrate 20th March as All Indian Day to ensure validity of left party. Jaiprakash was General Secretary of Congress Socialist Party and P. C. Joshi for Communist Party. Peasant council was against imperialism from the beginning itself through anti-feudal struggles.

Subhash Chandra Bose was president during 1938-39. He scolded Patel for abusing Sahajanand during Haripura Session.

KOMILLA* SESSION

Session was headed by Swamiji. Welcome committee was headed by lawyer from Komilla, Kamini Kumar Dutt. Membership was about 546800 at that time. That was the golden era of the council. Members from Bihar account to 2.5 lacs. (Two and half)

Chief organizers in Bihar were Swami Sahajanand Saraswati, Indulal Yagik, Karyanand Sharma, Rahul Sankatyanan, Yalunandan Sharma, Yamuna Karyi, Kishori Prassan Singh and Basawan Singh. In Uttar Pradesh in the beginning it was headed by Purshottam Das Tandon and Mohanlal Gautam which was later taken over by K. M. Ashraf, who organized a session in Pilibheet on 6-7th December 1936. In Punjab, Sohan Singh Josh and Mubarak Sagar worked for the council. Peasant council was weak in north western provinces. P. D. Marathe organized Marathi in central province. B. S. Bhushkate headed the regional session held in Nagpur on 15th April 1938. N. B. Khare organized it in central India. He was the chief minister there. 10000 farmers organized a rally in Morkha on 27th December out of which 2000 were tribal. Council was weak in Maharashtra. Few route march were organized. Conference was held in Gujarat under the leadership of M. Nariman on 28-29. May 1937. Leader in Haripura was

* Komilla is now in Bangla Desh.

Sumant Mehta, Suresh Dev, Karunanidhi Dev and Muzaffar Ahmad were leader in Surmaghati in Assam. Malti Choudhury, who was wife of Navkrishna choudhary was the head of Utkal province. N. G. Ranga and Rajeshwar Rao were in-charge in Andhra.

Swamiji said in Komilla session in 1938:

While Tricolour represents the nationalism, red flag represents the international unity and the desires of the exploited ones. This is international age wherein farmer and labour struggle has taken international form and they cannot achieve their goal without international unity. This is an essential symbol.

In short, friendly environment is not present and in absence of struggle no problem of poverty and hunger can be solved. Sahajanand was mentioning exploitation of zamindars and Britishers.

It was reposted in Hindustan daily on 10 August 2014 that a trader named Manik Lal chinai has built 'Daria Mahal' in 1930 at the cost of 15 lacs where Patel used to live. It was sold in 2014 in 100 crore. Priyanka Chopra purchased it. Ghanshyam Das Birla also used to provide accommodation to Patel in Bombay and Mansuri. Class of Patel and Rajendra Prasad was Zamindars and big business class. Rasool writes:

"Peasant council is a separate and independent council, this is a wrong assumption that congress only represents farmers. Separation from farm labours is bad for council. Peasant council is a union of exploited and there is no place for rulers. Council believes that revolution raises only from the lowermost section of the society. I believe that if the council is managed properly then it shall become more powerful than congress. Peasant revolution is gaining momentum and it is not possible for anyone to stop it. Farm labours are farmers. Who had land

yesterday are landless today. Who have it today shall be landless tomorrow. Farmers from whom land was snatched away are now farm labours. Small farmers are the source of the council (Kisan Sabha ka Itihaas, M. A. Rasool*)". This assertion was formulated by Swamiji. Swamiji gave a slogan:

Who owns Land? One who sows it.

May British Raj be destroyed.

May Zamindari System end

May loans end

Only earner should eat— this may lead to any thing—for it whatever may happen.

One who sows is farmer

One who produces food—clothes, only he shall run government

India belongs to them, they shall make rules now.

Establishing Kisan-Mazadoor rule was decided as the last objective of the Peasant council. Hollowness of the regional legislative councils and regional self-rule were exposed.

Swamiji commented in the session. "I thought a new thing in this session". Without protecting the farmers regularly and preparing strong volunteer group, we cannot proceed even a single step in fight against our enemies."

Farmers shouted:

"How shall you get the rent, our stick is ready".

Acharya Narendra Dev tried a lot that congress and Peasant council do not develop differences. Fourth session in Gaya ended in a haphazard manner. Swamiji was appointed the head and N. G. Ranga and Muzaffar Ahmad Dy. Head, Indulal Yagik, Damodar Swarup, Bukhari and Vasudev Rao as Joint Head and Yamuna Karyi was appointed treasurer.

This session was a model for discipline and unity.

* Rasool was Secretary of Kisan Sabha. He was echoing Swami Ji concept expressed in his book 'Khet Mazadoor'.

Purshottam Das Tandon and Khan Abdul Khan Gaffar also participated in the session.

Meeting of Tripuri Congress was held on 7-8th March in 1939 Tripuri. Here Subhash Bose with the support of peasant council was able to defeat Gandhiji's candidate Sitaramaiya and was re-elected as Chief of Congress.

Next Meeting of the Peasant Council was held on 22, 23 and 27th June in same year in Bombay. Acharya Narendra Dev was the head, following proposal was passed:

Council resist the proposal of the Congress Working Committee, which also has the support of Congress Committee, and clause of not going on Satyagraha without consent of the local Congress committee. Peasant Council appeals to the Congress Committee to reconsider the proposal and withdraw it. Committee also appeals to the state govt. to stop any kind of exploitation against the unarmed farmers and also request to end the Zamindari exploitation. Committee feels that sometimes it becomes imperative to act openly for the valid rights of the farmers.

In this way differences between Congress and Peasant council expanded. Congress Socialist were in great dilemma by working within the lines acceptable to Congress. Peasant Council was developing internal differences. Swamiji usually propagated non-violence but now he stopped barring them from use of arms for self-defence in small incidences in small proportion. Congress had Zamindars amongst its leaders at that time. Uneasiness was increasing in Congress due to rising Peasants-Zamindars struggle. Gandhiaites viewed this struggle as a reason for weakening of fronts against imperialism. Peasant council was of different opinion. They viewed Zamindars as a symbol of Imperialism and considered end of Zamindari as a imperative for ending Imperialism. Farmers didn't want independence in

instalments, they wanted it in one go. Complete independence was possible only through fighting against imperialism through anti feudal struggle. This caused differences between congress and Peasant Council which culminated in the form of Subhash Bose's rebellion and defeat of Gandhi.

Subhash's victory was not acceptable to Gandhi supporters. After few month of Tripuri session, Subhash Bose was removed from the post of Congress Chief. Gandhiji wanted that Patel group should control congress and old working committee should be kept intact. Subhash Bose wanted that 3 new members should be there in working committee, like:

1. Swami Sahajanand Saraswati, 2. Shardul Vikram Singh, 3. Nariman

Three members from socialist group who are acceptable to both groups, like:

1. Jawaharlal Nehru, 2. Narendra Dev, 3. Jaiprakash Narayan. Three members from Gandhi group should be taken.

This was not acceptable to Gandhiji (Khandilkar – Mahanayak). He wanted total control. Subhas was for composite working committee.

Gandhiji wanted previous Working committee to be in place. Even after agreement Subhash Bose was ready for three members from Gandhites (Diamond Pocket—Subhash Chandra Bose). It was clash of perception and world view which was different.

But, Gandhi did not like composite working committee. In the name of homogeneous working committee he wanted to block the entry of Sahajanand, Shardul and Nariman. This was unacceptable to Subhash. He considered committee incomplete without Swamiji. Swamiji wanted to gain freedom by snatching and fighting it out. This view was shared by Subhash also. Congress leadership had firm faith on justice of British. They favoured negotiations and compromise with them

and were satisfied with partial independence. They didn't feel the need of strong participation on formation of constitution. They favoured formation of regional councils with limited power. Subhash and Swamiji were firm opponent to this policy. They wanted complete independence and general voting rights and resignation of the Provincial minister's council. Thus both groups came up against each other. Congress broke and Subhash and Sahajanand were expelled from Congress undemocratically at the dictate of Gandhi.

Swamiji was of an independent mind, laborious, struggler, propagator of revolution and people's leader. Subhash Bose was fearless, sharp and Philosophical socialist. Their expulsion from Congress created hue and cry across the nation and progressive thinkers were full of sorrow when Subhash was expelled. Congress went into a state of stagnation. Gandhiaites had no action plan against Raj.

Under Swamiji and Subhash's leadership, a meeting was called on 19-20th March 1940 against the probable negotiations and compromise with the British by Gandhiaites. Yogendra Shukla, Kishori Prassan Singh, Dhanraj Sharma, Sheelbhadrā Yaji, Somnath Lahiri, Shardul Vikaram Singh, Nariman, Bukhari, Shankarlal and Harivishnu Kamath were part of this group. Then, Congress Meeting under Gandhiji was held in the adjoining premises which was attended by Patel, Rajendra Prasad, Shri Krishna Singh, Anugrah Narayan Singh, Kamakhya Narayan Singh—King of Ramgarh, Cricketer Jaipal Singh, Kriplani and Maulana Azad, M.N. Roy and Nehru. M.N. Roy and J.P. switched over to Gandhi..

A strong crowd was pulled towards Subhash. Swamiji and Subhash started 'British! Quit India' movement from this place and gave a slogan: "Evict the Britishers, Throw them out"
 "Give us Either Death or Freedom" "Kick them out"
 Other than total independence is not acceptable."

Admission of Indian soldiers in British Army and collecting revenues, both activities were stopped. Swamiji after this was arrested for three fierce speeches in Mangal Talab (Patna city), Bankipur Ground (Now Gandhi Ground) and Bilkar Sharif. He was sentenced for three years. Subhash expressed his fierce response in a column in 'Forward Block' and asked nation to jump into the struggle. He was kept under house arrest. He secretly moved out to Europe and Japan. Peasant council's activities were weekend as C.S.P. has deserted and Subhash was no more on the Indian Political scene. He had departed.

Swamiji wrote to Rasool, member of Peasant Council:

Forward Block members in Peasant council has abandoned us while Congress Socialists have stuck us in back. Now it's time for National Front. (Kisan Sabha ka Itihaas, M.A. Rasool, p. 75) National Frontiers (C.P.I) also deserted the Left Front and joined Gandhi.

Now, united front of left had crumbled under the situation. Rasool was in National Front. Communist party was known through National Front. This party considered Gandhiji as leader and Congress as united front in struggle against British. In Swamiji's view only Left front was real united front and Subhash would be the leader. M. N. Rai, Jaiprakash, Narendra Dev, P. C. Joshi favoured Gandhiji and suggested Subhash to have patience. Subhash was furious and impatient. Similar was the case with Sahajanand. This internal urge was common in both. Both were spiritual, Nationalist and pro-Marxist of varying degree.

PALASA SESSION

Palasa session had to be headed by famous scholar, Leader of farmers in Siwan, Rahul Sankaryanan. But he was arrested for conspiring against the British. All India Peasant Council meeting was held in Palasa in October 1941. Rasool was arrested so

Gopal Haldhar acted as the chief councillor. Congress socialist were loose at the front of peasant struggle. Membership of Kisan Sabha declined to 225000. P. Shyam Sunder Rao headed the welcome committee. Session was held on 26th March 1941 and Rahul's speech was read out. Sohan Singh Bhakhana was chief. He was leader of Gaddar Party and now a leader of Peasant council. He was a nationalist revolutionary. Baba Sohan Singh and Bhagat Singh Bilga were arrested after returning from attending the Central Peasant Council meet in Kolkata.

On 4th June, Germany attacked Russia. Swamiji, Indulal Yagik and M. N. Ray, in different perspective understood that it turned the character of the struggle. It was a mass war now and first task is to protect Russia, thus forces against British calmed down. Swamiji decided to re-organize Peasant Council in 1943 but by then Forward Block, Congress Socialist and Radical humanists left the council. Communist party was also not very active in peasant council due to Security concerns of Russia. This was an exceptional and difficult situation for in 1943 Swamiji. Indulal Yagik also separated himself fear of due to communists taking over the council. N. G. Ranga was separated since 1942. Congress Socialist got separated in 1941 in Dumarav Session. Forward Block distanced itself after Bihata Session in 1942. Indulal Yagik headed the sixth All India Session. Membership was 225781 at that time. In this session, Yadunandan Sharma as the head of Reception committee asked for arms so that they can participate in the struggle. K. N. Shandilya expressed his opposition against one opposing Subhash Bose. N. G. Ranga presented the main proposal and Bankim Mukherjee supported it. At Bihata clash took place between communist and Forward Block. Shandilya was beaten by a C.P.I. activist.

Meeting of Central Kisan Council was held in Bombay on 24-25th September 1942. Swamiji was also released from Jail.

Indulal Yagik, Swamiji, Bankim Mukherjee, Bhagat Singh Bilga and Lal Singh were present in the meeting. Invitees included Harsh Dev Malviya, N. H. Kanran, C. Rajeshwar Rao*, M. C. Pehalkar, Sharatpatnayak, Jaladdeen Shiddiqui, Parangkar and Chandra Bhai Bhatt.

Complete independence was demanded in Bihta and it was approved. Violence was criticized. N. G. Ranga didn't attend the session. He left the meeting. Member were sorrowful that an old member like N. G. Ranga has left. In fact, opposition of N. G. Ranga was result of increased influence of Communist in the Kisan Sabha. He was Nationalist not Marxist while Swamiji, Yognik and Subhas were near to Marxism with and National blending and spiritualism.

BHAKHNA SESSION

This session was held on 2-4th April 1943 in Bhakhna village in Punjab. This is the birth place of Baba Sohan Singh Bhakhna. Bankim Mukherjee was the chief. Membership was 285500 at that time. 231 delegate from 14 states participated in it.

Departure of Jaiprakash, Rambriksh Benipuri, Dhanraj Sharma, Sheelbhadra Yaji, Shatrughansharan Singh, Ramnandan Mishra, Ganga Sharan Singh, Basawan Singh resulted in decline in membership of the council. Country was facing famine. New Central Peasant Council was formed.

State election were held in Bihar between 22 and 27 January. Electoral, crossed the mark of 2 million. There were 152 seats to be contested out of which congress fought on 107 seats and won 98 of them. Reason for the victory was support of Peasant council and social stature of Swamiji. Congress won more seats of the legislative assembly. After those election Swamiji and Shri Krishna Singh were established as well-known orators.

On 20th July 1937 Congress formed the govt. under the

* Rajeshwar Rao latter on became general secretary of C.P.I.

leadership of Shri Krishna Singh. Ramdayalu Singh was elected speaker and Abdul Wari became Dy. Speaker. Anugrah Narayan Singh, Sayyad Mahmud and Jaglal Choudhary were appointed ministers. Shri Krishna Singh being an extraordinary orator and highly educated were closer to both Pt. Nehru and Peasant Council. He was also a councillor in peasant council in the past. Shri Babu raised the question of release of political prisoners. Yogendra Shukla was brought back from Andaman in the same line. Governor was not ready to release remaining 23 political prisoners. Consequently Shri Babu resigned on 15th Feb. 1938. It is to be noted that earlier S.K. Sinha was secretary of Bihar Provincial Kisan Sabha upto 1935 but after 1937 election his viewpoint changed drastically. Swamiji had visited 60 Mauzas and Mahals (group of villages) in only 10 days in 1933 in Gaya district. He travelled daily 16 to 20 mile on foot. He surveyed, interrogated, examined and collected the incidents and exploitations of Kisans by Zamindars. In this way Kisan Sabha get strengthened and the viewpoint of Swamiji spread, enriched and glowed. He came to the conclusion that all peasants are alike, their happiness, sorrow are the same, regardless of caste and creed. They are simple, hungry, devastated and poor. Leaders divide than, breaks their unity in the name of religion, caste, language and serves the purpose of Empire and zamindars. He toured extensively in turbulent days of 1939-40 alongwith Subhas in Bihar and elsewhere before the anti compromise conference to be held on 19-20 March 1940 at Ramgarh in opposition to Gandhi's compromise conference to be held at the same venue (Ramgarh). Sahajanand and Subhas attended not less than 450 meeting in Bihar in one year inspite of the illness of Subhas. Gandhi had the support of big millowners like Birla and Dalmia and strong muslimen managers like Shri Krishna Sinha, Anugrah Narayan Sinha. Ram Naryan Singh, Raja Kamkhyia Narayan Singh and

Christian leader Jaipal Singh. Gandhi had managed to collect not less than 2 lac men but when Sahajanand and Subhas came on dais in front of Gandhi and started giving clarion call to enter into "Angrej Bhagao" campaign, all the men assembled around Gandhi, deserted him and came to hear Sahajanand and Subhas. Gandhi was defeated in Tripuri in 1939 in Congress election, now he was defeated in general mass court. Sahajanand and Subhas were imprisoned very soon. Sahajanand after release from jail travelled extensively in 1943 as per 31.1.1943 report published in Hunkar signed Mathura Prasad Singh, Secretary Gaya district Kisan Sabha.

1. 4.2.43 Warsaliganj	2. 5.2.43 Pakari Barawan
3. 6.2.43 Siswan	4. 7.2.43 Sarawn
5. 8.2.43 Khijir Saray	6. 9.2.43 Hulasganj
7. 10.2.43 Nimeihak	8. 11.2.43 Mer
9. 12.2.43 Sarata	10. 13.2.43 Kurpt
11. 16.2.43 Aurangabad	

Peasant council was very hopeful from congress govt. Death of this hope marked the beginning of the new struggle. Farmers were involved in rallies, interferences and beating up of Zamindars. With efforts of Rajendra Babu and Maulana Kalam Azad, Zamindar Congress Agreement was passed in Bihar and consequently, Bihar Tenancy Adjustment Act was easily passed.

Due to increased farmers resistive struggles and pro-Zamindar policies of Congress, introduced a bill on 30th September. Public was appraised about the declining revolutionary trend in Congress. This bill had an impression of Swamiji's thoughts: but was pro-zamindar in essence.

We continuously fight with each other in elections on different issues.

He further wrote:

“Can such cabinet formulate a law for liberating India? No. This is a strategic step by British that they had cheated us. Their motive is to keep the revolutionaries entangled in this act and demolish the spirit of revolution. Then it would not be hard to demolish Indians with one powerful stroke. They thought that congress shall transform into a reformist union and I see that they very succeeding in this. But can we allow this?

We have two actions in our fight for freedom. First is participation of the mass. Reformation is followed by it but we have observed that while on path of reformation we are losing the support of masses. This is an alarming situation.”

Recession was there since 1929 and due to that production from farms declined by 50 percent. Farmers were worried. This legislation was insufficient for farmers. New requirements were demanding revolutionary steps. Swamiji wrote two books on Congress Zamindari supporting attitude: The other side of the shield and Rent Reaction in Bihar: How it works.

Wage Payment legislation was passed in Uttar Pradesh but it was not passed in Bihar. This was complained by peasant council. Swamiji criticized congress cabinet for not fulfilling their election promises. A huge protest was held on 23rd August 1937 in Patna. 17th October was celebrated as Farmer's Day. Peasant revolutions started at several places.

Swamiji also participated in these meetings. Lohia, in Masaudi, Bihar Sharif, Badhiya and Lakhisarai was with Swamiji. Jai Prakash Narayan was appointed Bihar Congress Gaya district chief on the directions of Swamiji to Yadu Nandan Sharma.

Shri Krishna Singh appealed while speaking in a Peasant Meeting in Bakhtiyarpur on 4th December 1937:

“Farmers should not try to forcefully occupy Bakashat land”. In 1938 there were 5 peasant supporters amongst 36

member of All India Congress Committee from Bihar which included Swamiji and Jaiprakash Narayan from Gaya. Now the path of peasant council was getting segregated from that of congress. Now it was taking the form of left who were not always non-violent.

Subhash Bose was the Congress Chief at that time. He cleared the situation:

We can be independent only if people are freed from all sorts of evils. Congress should try to maximize the participation of farmers and should work to bring them under their flag to work in the revolution. Congress accepts farmer's right to union.

Proposal of abolishing Zamindari could not be passed even though Subhash Bose was the chief at that time. But after Subhash defeated Ramaiya in January 1939 there was a wave of excitement amongst the Peasant council and Socialist group. Swamiji and Jaiprakash expressed their pleasure in a joint statement:

We believe that those who do not support Bose would also agree that selection of Bose in such difficult circumstances is good for congress (Indian Annual Register, 1939, Part 1, page 6).

Political meet was held in old Gaya on 9-10th February 1939 where Subhash Bose and Swamiji were to be chief orator. This meeting proved out to be the meeting point of fierce leftist. Fourth All India Peasant Council was also held on similar lines in Gaya from 1st to 10th April. Swamiji was propagating strong farmer revolution. Narendra Dev and Jaiprakash adopted softer stand and kept alliance with congress alive. Swamiji crossed the lines drawn by congress and considered Gandhiji's methods insufficient for farmers. Farmers were getting rid of old methods

and were developing a new enthusiasm for the struggle. Farmers were on the political stage with a new energy. This uprising of farmers brought basic changes in the thinking pattern and new slogans were raised.

Narendra Dev said in his speech:

Farmers need to be appraised about being disciplined.
Peasant council should work with congress.

Working with congress was proving difficult for Swamiji. Peasant revolution was ongoing in Bihar even after repression. 1st July was celebrated as Prisoner Farmers Day. Peasant leaders were not given political prisoner status in jails. They were treated like notorious criminals.

Amongst the peasant leaders from Uttar Pradesh Saryu Pandey, Jhanrkhande Rai, Narendra Shastri, Algu Rai Shastri*, Visvanath Mardana, Keshav Prasad Sharma, Jai Narayan Singh, Arjun Singh Bhadauriya, Shibban Lal Saxena, Purshottam Das Tandon and Mohan Lal Gautam are famous personalities.

In Basti, struggle was fought against removing bataidars. Forced labour was stopped in Shivgarh state. In Punjab struggle was fought on matter of canals. In Gwalior also forced labour of tribal was stopped.

To train peasant group, it was decided to open a school in Sariya village in Gaya District. These trained peasants are organizing protests in a peaceful manner. However, small fights were exceptional. Thus volunteers of farmers were raised in Navada and Dev, Aurangabad. Swamiji inaugurated the Dev meet on 11 November 1938.

Congress was not in a state to sacrifice their Muslim leader,

* Algu Rai Shastri was a great leader of congress who along with Swamiji and Tandan opposed Gandhi on 15-16 June 1947 in A.I.C.C. meeting held at Delhi when Gandhi advocated of favour of Partition. Keshav Prasad Sharma was from R.S.P.

who now were only left in few numbers. On 3rd September 1939 England declared war against Germany and mass destruction started. Viceroy said: 'British government want to increase co-operation between India and Britain so that colonial self-rule status can be granted to India. Swamiji and Subhas rejected the dominion status.

Meeting of Congress Working committee was concluded on 19-23 November 1939 in Allahabad. A proposal was passed in it:

Congress shall continue to find ways for normal agreements.

In fact, Congress considered achieving colonial self-rule status where there is not conflict from imperialism, in a Westminster manner, as its goal.

Swamiji and Subhash Bose immediately rejected Colonial self-rule and British negotiations doubting British Justice parameters and raised the demand for complete independence through struggle as the Aim and Strategy. On 7th March 1940 Jaiprakash appealed to leftist to maintain their unity.

Subhash Bose spoke in two meetings on 15th January 1940. On 24th January he spoke in Lucknow. He could not visit Gaya due to section 144 in force. He spoke in Jahanabad on 8th February. He said that threats for Britain are opportunities for India. Swamiji was in agreement with Subhash. Following section was published in Tirhut Daily in area of his influence:

This is strange that children of one producing so much food die of starvation and others enjoy. Student meeting was held in Begusarai under the leadership of famous Scholar and peasant leader Rahul Sankartaynan. Subhash Bose was the chief speaker. On their lives. O Great Fighter Subhash, we believe in you and that you shall lead us through this difficult path. You raise the slogan and we shall jump into

the struggle. Enemy shall now know what Indians can do for protecting the pride of their motherland.

Swamiji said in Darbhanga:

Don't believe outsider leaders. Become your own leader. I have seen many outsiders but nothing has happened. Leader come to lecture you on the cost of your money. You know it very well that a lecture of million Rupees cannot produce a single grain of rice. Lecture cannot satisfy hunger and thirst. You people are better than leaders. You are the one who produces so you can also produce your own leaders. One amongst you shall better understand your needs. One who does not suffers cannot understand other's pain. I warn you against such leaders. You are not alone. You are millions in number. When you shall unite then Zamindars will fear in hell. They are very less in number. They exploit with support from officials. You people do these three things: become united, never give up your land even if you are required to die for it, and never visit courts. Peasant council shall help you. Recognize your strength. All Say Long Live Revolution. (Balchanwan, Nagarjuna)

This was the furious expression from Swamiji's heart. He didn't wanted freedom in instalment. He favoured struggle under Subhash for attaining complete independence by snatching it from old governance. But communist party, Radical party and socialist party lead by P. C. Joshi, M. N. Rai and Jaiprakash respectively were of the view that the current struggle can be lead only by Gandhiji and first phase shall be in the hands of industrialists who represent national character. They named this as Social Front, National Front. Subhash and Swamiji appealed to form a front which should comprise of students, youths, farmers, labour and soldiers leading the front row. It

was United Front of real left.

On 3rd February 1940 student meeting was held in Begusarai where famous peasant struggler and scholar Rahul Sankartyana was the chief. Subhash Bose was the chief speaker. Swamiji was arrested on 19th April. Umashanker Shukla was arrested from Bagha. Subodh Kumar, Anil Kumar Mitra, Muhammad Ismail, Sharat Chandra Patnayak, Praful Chandra Acharya and Ramesh Chandra were expelled from Area. Vishwanath Prasad Mathur, Dayanand Jha, Vinod Bihari Mukherjee were placed under house arrest in Gaya. Basawan Singh, Ram Nandan Mishra and Ram Singh Akali were also arrested on 29th April. Kishori Prassan Singh was arrested on 24th June. On 16th December Sheelbhadrā Yaji was also arrested. In Naubatpur Niharendu Dutt Mazumdar and Dhanraj Sharma were arrested. In Jamshedpur, Shri Page, Yogendra Shukla and Karyanand Sharma were arrested. Yogendra Shukla was a famous revolutionary and was recently appointed as chief of provincial committee of peasant council. Benipuri was editor of Janta who was sentenced for 1 year on 11th May 1940. British, Quit India movement started on 19th May 1940 under Subhash Bose and Swamiji which was joined by Gandhiji on 7th August 1942 belately. Ramgarh became the center for struggle. On 19th March the Progressive group of congress protested against the compromising approach of congress and raised slogans for the Independence. It was decided to start this struggle through students, peasants, labours and youths. It was known as Anti-compromise conference. It was led by Swamiji and Subhas and Presided by Subhas.

SIXTH ALL INDIAN PEASANT SESSION (BIHATA)

This session took place from 29-31 May. It was presided by Indulal Yagik, from Gujarat. He was editor of Kisan Bulletin published from Delhi. The membership of peasant council was .

225781 at that time. The decline in membership was result of differences with congress, separation of socialist congress and imprisonment of peasant leaders. This affected the working of the council. Yadunandan Sharma headed the reception committee. Leader spoke about the changing scenarios of Second World War and National Freedom.

In this session proposal against Japan was presented by N.G. Ranga and was supported by Bankim Mukherjee. Representative of Forward block resisted the proposal. Communist party emphasised on increasing food production. Peasant council meeting was held in Kolkata. Stanford Crips arrived in India in same time. His motive was to gain support from Muslim League and Congress through negotiations. Gandhiji and communist became softer towards British due to different reasons. In such circumstances Peasant council activities were suffering on dual fronts. On 25th August 1942 Swamiji and Yadunandan Sharma issued a press release:

We acknowledge that govt. has committed a mistake by arresting congress leaders. Can any sane person call this freedom struggle?

Call by Gandhi for "Quit India" had no action plan in 1942. It was only individual satyagraha. Gandhi had forbidden mass participation and had written as such to Lord Linlithgo (India to say Ranji Palme Dutt). Sawamiji was for mass uprising whereas Subhas preferred rebellion. Both were complementary supplementary to each other.

Swamiji believed that Peasant issue was the main and real element of the national struggle. Till the producing population is not provided economic freedom, political freedom is just for the bureaucrats. This can only be achieved through fierce revolution thereby providing solution to the farmer's issues. This cannot be achieved by burning post-offices and police

stations. Swamiji was a poor man's representative and he was aware of their plight. He believed that freedom of farmers is the crust of the freedom struggle. He understood that symbolic fight advocated by Gandhi will lead to Zamindar-Maladar Rule.

Cabinet mission agreement, Crips Agreement could not also provide economic independence to farmers. British govt. was sitting comfortably on the support of Zamindars. Governance without participation of masses was no governance as per Swamiji. Swamiji forbade socialist against romantic adventurism and communist against their "grow more food campaign" to help Brisith-Instead he advocated for spreading Kisan Sabha unit. This was not acceptable to communists. After 1944 both of them developed core differences and these were exposed to the surface. Swamiji fought on all fronts for the interests of farmers and even after being abandoned by all didn't leave the path of truth and principles. He favoured participation of labour and farmers in governance. This was the source for mass uprising, not a source of conspiracy. Differences with Jaiprakash were on these points. Swami was for establishment of Kisan-Mazadoor Raj whereas C.S.P. was Nehruite.

Meeting of Central Peasant Council was held on 24-27 September 1942 in Bombay. Swamiji was part of this. Swamiji presented a brief note on the current scenario and peasant struggle. N. G. Ranga resigned sighting increasing influence of Communist in Peasant Council. Similar thing was done by Yagik in 1943 and Swamiji in 1945. Swamiji did not like the attitudes of Political Parties to treat Kisan Sabha as their mass front.

EIGHTH ALL INDIA PEASANT SESSION, BAIJWADA 14-15 MARCH 1944

Swamiji criticised Pakistan favouring policies of Communist party in his speech. He was against two Nation theory.

Country was going through dejection and suffocation which

was evident on Swamiji as well.

Swamiji replied to the subject committee:

Comrade Bankim Mukherjee has rightly pointed that the displeasure in the country has depressed me but we shall attain Independence, we shall be strong and we shall win. Our rulers think that they are getting stronger and others also who are undefeatable—Russia, China and India are connected to each other in a philosophical manner and we shall win on the basis of our able friends. We are on the path of victory.

Under Swamiji's pressure the characteristics of the meeting were changed. It was made fiercer. Three-fourth support was made mandatory for passing a proposal. This was done to break the communist monopoly. M. A. Rasool accused Swamiji of personalizing things in his book. Swamiji believed in social governance but not by sacrificing personal freedom of an individual. Swamiji searched for such governance but the communist party was more dependent on their English and Russian partners. Harkishan Singh Surjit has written in his book 'Kishan Sabha Ka Itihaas':

Swami Sahajanand got separated in 1945. He was against self-determination policy of communists on Pakistan. Even after resignation he was respected by colleagues of Peasant Council. Party named its Patna Session in his name Swami Sahajanand City Golden Jubilee.

Later Surjit accepted that they had differences with Swamiji but time has proved him right. Similar points were made by Jyoti Basu and Surjit while withdrawing their previous estimation on Swamiji and Subhash. Swamiji resisted policies of parties to consider Peasant Council as their mass organization. Swamiji said in his speech in Baijwada:

When we take the responsibility of serving the mass but do not become ready to pay for it, we shall continue to wander in this dark unorganized system and there is no hope of coming out of it.

He further said:

For meeting these objectives we need people who can sacrifice their lives for serving farmers, who are eager to work in rural areas, and devote their energy and intelligence for this great task.

This is the reason that we should form a group of workers who are entirely devoted and limited to the peasant council and treat it as their God.

Swamiji saw trouble for British in Second World War as an opportunity for peasant council and to form Farmer unions but congress was engaged in negotiating with the British. Forward Block were expecting from defeat of British. Communist were aligned with British for protecting Russia.

This was a sorrowful time for the national struggle. Swamiji said in Baijwada Session:

If this revolution is to be successful then small changes shall not help. And country needs to change internally in their vision and nature before this external change. Revolution should be sourced from mind, body and soul and this is a difficult task to accomplish. Till the people are ready to break away the rules and do not develop a strong urge for revolution, exploitation cannot be stopped.

Swamiji was not reformist, he was revolutionary.

Swamiji on contrary to communist was pointing towards social awareness and was also not neglecting physical circumstances. Swamiji considered four parts of Vedanta

Dharma, Kama, Arth and Moksha as the main source and considered Marxian philosophy as the source limited to Arth only. He was a firm believer who had adopted Vedanta in his heart and used Marxist philosophy through his mind. He provided a human face to the Marxist philosophy. It was natural that other Marxists and vedantics were unhappy with him. He reshaped both Vedant and Marx according to Indian tradition useful for toiling masses.

Swamiji spoke on importance of Peasant council:

Amongst all the institutions, peasant council is the only union which represents the plight of most backward and rural 80 percent part of the population in a true manner. Thus Peasant council is the best union for the masses.

In fact farmers were the main source of national struggle. In their absence any other union was a bunch of bureaucrats. Labours, Soldiers, Youth and Students born out of farmer reserves only. Swamiji was in favour of setting political arrangement from the economic viewpoint where the interest of farmers are protected, not that farmers become a tool for getting their policies approved. Decline in Peasant council functioning was like prevailing situation in Ireland. Swamiji said in Baijwada:

Doubtlessly, united India for us is one which, which I pray for, provides shelter to all irrespective of their caste, religion, and section etc. handing control in hands of farmers and labour is the core principle for self-rule. So can we ask if Jinnah and Muslim League are ready for this?

If awareness would have been made source of decision-making then those demanding Pakistan would have ran away. But lack of awareness amongst farmers pushed country into partition. Congress's policy of negotiating and communist's policy of

supporting league created a situation of haphazard and Swamiji describes it as:

We jumped into burning mines after coming out of vessel of boiling oil.

Acharya Narendra Dev said on 1st August on occasion of Tilak Jayanti:

We might laugh at this today but it was true in 1916 that the president of congress in Lucknow session, Ambika Charan Mazumdar said that if today British agree to leave India then we would beg them not to abandon us in this orphaned manner.

This speech was published in *Sangharsh Magazine* on 24th September 1945. Acharya Narendra Dev told in All India Peasant Council (Kisan Sabha) Meeting on 24th September 1945:

When I joined peasant council I thought I would serve farmers through this. But I would not be able to work with those who share their philosophy and mentality with the communists.

He was targetting Swami Sahajanand who was dead against Nehru-Gandhi leadership.

In Gaya Session on 9th April 1939 Narendra Dev warned against threat to peasant council.

“Purpose of Peasant council is to make congress stronger”.

This was the limit of Narendra Dev. On the contrary, Swamiji wanted that governance should be under farmers Labourars. (Source: Radiant Publication, Narendra Dev Rachnawali)

Narendra Dev wanted to limit the farmers demand to relief through Peasant council in the national struggle. Swamiji wanted

to cross the lines to establish a government under the farmer-labour union. Swami ji was for Kisan-Mazdoor raj not for relief only.

On similar lines he defined a farmer:

Those who are in the lowermost section of the society, are the ones closer to us. Thus one who is a farm labour or Harijan they are closest to us. After this there are small farmers and this is where the definition of a farmers end. (Maharudra Ka Mahatandav, 1949, Speech in Baijwada 1944)

“It is the duty of the members of the peasant council to expose this thinking and should take care that the effect of this should be deleted from the heart and mind of the public. Till this is not done, no expectations can be developed from public”.

It is evident that Swamiji was not against any religion, he was against superstitions, and he propagated hard work, ability to start the task. He supported Social language and mass culture.

On 9th April 1945 in his speech as the chief he quoted verses from Bhagwat Geeta in the religious meet:

When Narsingh, after killing Hrinanyakarshyap, asked Prahlad to come along to Vaikunth, he clearly refused and said that leaving this human society in pity will make me feel like hell in Vaikunth. I am not selfish sage who leaves the issues of world and sits in a jungle and wish to go to heaven or Vaikunth. Prahlad instead of muting wanted to propagate the voice of the ones who are exploited. That's why he called sages selfish. Do we have the same urge for serving people? I am a follower of same path and have urge to see others also on same path. This is what has dragged me here.

“We left our homes for huts, left our land and took shelter in temples. What is this? This is Vairagya whose ignorance has brought us in this situation. We pushed the religion and now

are in hell but are still propagating that we shall protect the religion. Earlier world was blind but now they are one eyed. That's why world laugh at these superstitions. We should pledge to use properties of temples for betterment of others, should remove corrupts from the temples, and then no one shall be able to raise a finger on us."

"This is becoming true word by word. Those who were called sadhu and sages are the corrupt ones today, so is it fine to accuse others? Downfall of leaders have further opened the path of downfall."

Communist party laughed at Swamiji for participating in the religious meet, without thinking that Swamiji was propagating progressive thoughts there. Swamiji only promoted only positives traditions. He was a patient and sharp person. He was one for whom religion was continuously evolving and changing with the times for benefit of the people. He was not an orthodox figure. Swamiji was testing the character of sadhus and was hopeful of correcting the manners of the behavioural front. He was also dragging them towards serving the mass.

Swamiji said:

Only earner should eat—this may lead to any thing", this slogan can be led by religious front. All obstacles can be removed for establishing farmer-labour rule. What do they fear of? Neither of Jail nor of Death sentence, nor have they needed to look after their families or children. They alone can fill the prisons to teach the rulers some lesson. They alone can lead the front for Farmers and labours and can repay the loans for the usage of food and clothes produced by them. They will have to do this.

Swamiji was inducing sadhus to participate in the mass struggle by reminding them of their background, i.e. farmers and labours. Swamiji was even more confident on Vedanta than

Vivekananda. Vivekananda dragged the Idealism near to materialism to the verge. Swamiji dragged it to the center of the storm. He expressed his strong desire in following way:

I believe that with support of the sadhus, this unit shall rest only after it accomplishes its goal.

Sadhus owned temples having wealth and resources. Swamiji wanted to use them for establishing the Farmer-labour governance. Sadhus were whole timer even after abandoning their homes. Communist party viewed religion as a drug and wanted to use farmers and labours as their followers. Their organisations cannot have independent status. Such communist thinking depresses a person. Swamiji favoured personal freedom of an individual if it is not breaking the social structure. This was personalization in the eyes of communists and they criticised Swamiji for this. Breaking up of Russia proved Swamiji's point. If a social structure bounds personal freedom of an individual then it is surely on the path of destruction. This is what happened with Russia. Swamiji was in favour union Association, mass organizations. He was against dictatorship of a person, coterie or single class.

Swamiji wrote about the state of farmers:

Mahadev Baba himself used to lie in the graveyard but used to distribute things amongst his followers –make them big, don't know why. No one has seen this with his eyes. But these farmers and wage earners are also such Mahadev Baba who themselves are getting bankrupt but are making others great and nourishes them.

It is clear that farmers were God for him. He used to narrate ancient instances and stories to explain this concepts to people. His Vedantic religion was not based on idol worshiping and was also not obstructed by dedication to farmers. He considered

helping farmers as serving God. He writes:

Till there is no enlightenment among Kisan and Mazdoors there is no question of enlightening the society, Bread is greater than God.

Thus his philosophical vision was Vedantic Marxism. Due to this he considered enlightenment as the source of change based on materialism. Swamiji took theory of class struggle and conception of history based on class from Marx. But he believed that Marx is inadequate. It has mind not heart. It should be supplemented by Gita Dharm for other things. He viewed history from the sectional point of view. This made him different from socialist, communist and liberals of the country. In the same sense Ruskin, Tolstoy, Laski, Roja, Spehero and Kant's Indian followers were different from socialist, communists and humanitarians. Swamiji wanted to transform economic struggle into national struggle. He was disappointed by the compromise policies of Congress which resulted in Crips, Cabinet, Vawel, Gopalachari, Bhulabhai and Mountbatten agreements. He writes:

Usually we cannot get our rights without fighting and miraculously if we get them, they cannot be sustained. Reason being, without struggle there cannot be power and can one who is powerless protect his rights?

Swamiji didn't believe in transfer of governance, instead he favoured snatching it. Self-dependence of Japan, China, France and USA is due to the same reason. Reason of India's weakness is attaining independence under agreement. The wave of independence which was started by Subhash—Sahajanand could not attain its objective of total freedom. Parliamentarians considered themselves lucky after getting rule of divided India partially. Parliamentarians achieved their goal of dominion status.

TIDE OF PEASANT STRUGGLE

Mahatma Gandhi and Jinnah met separately with viceroy on 5th and 6th February 1940 but British government refused to move. Negotiators were depressed with this. Indian National Congress was preparing for its 53rd session in Ramgarh in Hazaribagh district. Compromisers in Congress were confident that this isolated place is completely protected from Subhash's influence in east in Bengal and Swami Sahajanand's influence in north in Central Bihar. Further king of Ramgarh was strong supporter of compromisers and tribal leader Jaipal Singh was also amongst the compromisers. Working committee was formed for the meeting. Maulana Azad was the elected president for Congress. Sahajanand and Subhas were leaders of anti- compromisers.

If the same situation would have continued then surely this would have turned into a united front but right wing in congress was not ready to accept the increasing influence of labours and farmers in congress. They viewed congress as a tool to force imperialists for negotiation and compromise. Right Wing viewed labours protest against Mill Owners and peasant protest against Zamindars as violence and as a threat to the non-violence. They proposed to change the regulations of congress by appointing the representatives for the session rather than electing them and also proposed that no new membership should be allowed. In 1939 session the All India Congress Committee accepted the proposal of the working committee. Without permission of regional congress committee, organizing satyagrah was prohibited. By taking this step the Right Wing ensured that congress remains out of the joint national front as proposed by Subhas-Sahajanand. (Bharat ka Mukti Sangram, Ayodhya Singh, Page 663)

It was strange that even after seeing all this India's communist party, Congress Socialist Party and Radical Party didn't supported Subhash-Sahajanand in their meeting at the Ramgarh. Instead considering Congress as the joint front gave

opportunity to the right wing by not working on formation and uniting the left wing. Subhash's defeat became defeat of leftist defeat in the eyes of Hansraj Rehbar. This was true. Had left not abandoned Subhas India world have been freed in 1940-41 as Britain was involved world war.

Congress Session concluded with a lot of celebrations. Large stage was made in accordance to the landscape and was decorated in a creative manner. All big leaders from the country and regions gathered to show their strength to the anti-compromisers makers but as soon as the speech of Subhas-Sahajanand started all crowd moved towards them and compromising were left with just the formalities. Subhash-Sahajanand's meeting against the compromisers policies was also held on 19-20th March close to the location of right wing. Gandhiji's group was near the river bank and Subhash's was at a higher place. Gandhiji's group faced problems with start of rain. However as soon as Subhash's Session started rain stopped and session was concluded without any obstacle.

Subhash was the leader of meeting against the compromise and Swamiji was the chief of reception committee.

This meeting was against any type of compromise with the British government. Swamiji raised National Struggle as the main theme and Poet Shardul Vikram Singh supported it. Congress's policy of compromise was criticised and right of Indians for complete independence was propagated. Meeting supported the appeals of farmers. Proposal of abolishing Zamindari was approved in it. Reducing the taxes and canal charges by 50 percent was also suggested. This meeting warned the imperialists and its supporters. Subhash emphasised on utilizing the opportunity provided by second word war. Swamiji emphasises on struggle driven politics.

* However, Somnath Lahiri, Kishori Prasan Singh and soli Bataliwala of C.P.I. supported subhas-Sahajanand at Ramgarh.

Swamiji criticised the head bowing policies of Congress. On 6th April he appealed to increase the force of struggle by starting it at Pan India level. They said that the struggle represented Indians vows to keep themselves away from the world war and their desire to achieve independence of India. This announcement was made in response to Gandhiji's article published in the daily *Harijan* titled 'Each congress committee a Satyagrah in itself'. In the article Gandhiji asked congressmen to continue creative struggle and keep the hopes alive on it. Sessions of congress emphasised on simplicity, creative programs, discipline and non-violence and not struggle. In Subhash and Swamiji's point of view this non-violent, not struggle attitude was supporting imperialists and wealthy ones who continued their exploitation. Swamiji said in Ramgarh session held in protest of compromising policies of congress:

On behalf of reception committee, I feel privileged to present this small but hearty gift to the great people engaged in the freedom struggle.

He further said :

We have gathered here at a moment when we are standing at a critical juncture in the freedom struggle. Our enemy is fighting for his existence at his home against a larger force. It is such a pathetic condition that a great nation who has been fighting a strong imperialist for last scores of years, where it has been successful, is now at a situation where its future is full of opportunities but it is standing still. Is this a time when we should think about compromising with them? Is this not the right time to fight and attack them with full force so that we can attain freedom for which we have been fighting for such a long time. An imperialist who is fighting for its own existence is rejecting our demand for the colonial self-rule, still we are looking for negotiations, and this thought is beyond my

understanding. Does this policies represent a nation which has challenged its British Imperialist at many fronts?

We want that people should snatch away the powers from rulers those who use it to exploit the farmers, labours and other producers politically, socially and financially. In this we want to make the people most powerful by granting them the authority and power and thereby ending all forms of exploitations. This can be achieved only with social struggle involving no compromise. He further said:

Country is not ready to fight—saying this, is baseless. Reality is that financial troubles have touched the core of the population and political wave which has emerged out of it has invoked a new ray of hope. As a result the lowermost section of the society has become suitable for the self-developing and great revolution. Then there are middle and upper class who have been living with their support and then there are imperialist British. Now no national level struggle can be accomplished without involving this (lower most) section and result can be that this rising might invoke the middle and upper class to participate in the struggle and thus breaking away the British. Our middle class which was leading the struggle know this fact and it fear that if this struggle begins then its destruction is guaranteed.

He further said :

We are not against Khadi, Charkha and Village industry. We accept their role in the country's economy. But we cannot accept this Gandhian philosophy as the base for the future of the country. We believe that they shall extinct in the course of time and will be seen only in museums. Thus our differences is with the Gandhian philosophy which is basic and principle. That's why we are against four creative programmes of Gandhiji.

And Non-violence...we are ready to give complete independence and control to the national struggle for attainment of independence. But yes if they fail to free population through these means from three types of evils then we shall adopt other means for independence.

A doctor asks a patient before treating him that either you are cured or not but you shall not visit any other doctor. On the other hand patient wants to keep this option open that if the doctor fails to cure him then he can visit other doctor. Here Gandhiji is on forcing to adopt non-violence as the only mean for freedom struggle. Farmers, labours, students, youths and soldiers are making history and moving forward. Then how can they be called unprepared. Non-violence and changing hearts creates problem in developing society. If I state clearly, I never believe in these measures. In short while we want all round revolution, other group wants only reforms in all fields. This is the reason they are worried about the agreements. Agreements are base to reformist mentality and they want to live on that basis. By three types of evils, he meant feudalism, capitalism, imperialism.

It is clear that Swamiji initiated 'British, Quit India' movement with this clear announcement. He was arrested on 19th April 1940 and Subhash Chandra was placed under house arrest. On these days Gandhiji cleared his pro-British stand:

Any general of an army clears his conditions of leading to the soldiers, but at this juncture I will be acting harsh. Britain is stuck in world war. Naturally if we resist them now their problems shall increase. This is first problem but our real problems are internal.

In context of internal issues I feel that we no more believe

in non-violence. Congress is now indiscipline and there is groupism. There are internal differences and fights. When we move as one army we no more remain democratic because army follows one General and has to follow discipline. For them general's words are like rules. I am your General. Dictator Gandhi was dictating his condition and term.

I wrote to Lord Chemsfield that I want to keep faith in the empire as a British has in his heart. You may have other options than truth and non-violence but I shall still follow that old track. You must understand this clearly that negotiation is in my nature. If required I am ready to go to Viceroy 5 times. My struggle is based on respect for the opposition, if anyone wants to initiate any struggle then I would not stop him but he shall have to work outside congress. If he wants to remain in congress then he will have to follow its program me and policies.

We do not have any fight with British. We want to remain as their friend and we wish for their good wishes. Truth and Non-violence is the soul of Satyagrah and Charkha is its symbol. Without faith in truth, non-violence and charkha one cannot be my soldier and I repeat this that if you don't believe in this then you may leave me and adopt your own means. Thus Gandhi helped Empire in the hour of distress.

In session of 1940, Pt. Nehru presented the main political proposal. Proposal was supported by Acharya Kriplani. Swamiji and Subhash got pissed off with the speech of Gandhiji. While Gandhiji was in favour of peace with British, Subhash and Swamiji declared them as their enemy. While Gandhiji wanted to achieve the goal through supporting colonial Swaraj demand and compromise, Subhash and Swamiji wanted to achieve it through struggle in the form of complete independence. While

Gandhiji was emphasising on Non-violence, Swamiji and Subhash were suggesting other ways also. Gandhiji was in favour of governance transfer while Subhash wanted to achieve governance through struggle. While Gandhiji was focusing on single leadership through capture. Subhash and Swamiji were emphasising on collaborative approach. While Gandhiji was emphasising on Khadi and rural industry, Subhash and Sahajanand were focusing on science and technology as the future. For Gandhiji problems for British was a matter of sympathy, for Swamiji and Subhash it was a clear opportunity which should not be missed. Gandhiji's social base were bureaucrats, middle class and wealthy supporters, Swamiji-Subhash emphasised on farmers, labours, students, soldiers and youths. Thus differences were natural. Due to Peasant revolution the membership of the peasant council was 6 lakh which rose to 8 lakhs in 1939. To break this force, a section of congress promoted many other organizations of farm labours, Triveni Sangh, fake farmer council and Muslim association etc. But people were in favour of Subhash and Swamiji. Speaking from the dais of in Anti-compromise meeting Subhash said:

Friends

People who think that congress is the largest compromise opposing party have perhaps lost their memory. They must be reminded about how World War started—Gandhiji without consulting the congress committee went to Shimla and informed Viceroy that he is ready to support Great Britain unconditionally. Can those people not think that Gandhiji is the only dictator in congress and should his thoughts should not be tested? Did they forgot that when World War started then congress committee side-lined the demand of Complete Independence and asked for a fake constitution. Did they forgot that few right wing leaders,

who are also members of congress are considering on different ways of forming a constitution and are including clauses such as separate voter list for Hindu and Muslims and are dreaming to form a constitutional body which shall be only based on legislative assembly. Did they forgot that few ministers are trying to regain the ministries after dissolving of provincial congress ministries? Did they forgot that for last 6 months Gandhiji is trying hard to negotiate with British? Are they not aware they after giving fierce speeches, internal negotiations are taking place?

“It is our misfortune that British government has understood that congress and congress leader may pass a proposal but they shall not fight for it.”

“Era of imperialism is about to end and century of Socialism, Democracy and Independence is about to begin. India is standing at a critical juncture. If we wish for it then we should participate in it because world is waiting for us to contribute. Losing faith is the biggest loss. We should not lose faith our people have on us in this critical point of time. These kind of situations are test of ability and qualification for the national leaders. Current situation has tested our leader of their ability and sadly they have not been successful.”

“Biggest threat in present times is that one who called themselves associated with left wing are themselves confused and dejected. Coming times shall soon test these left wing members and ones who will not be clear the test of times shall not be eligible to be called a left wing member. Today loose and unclear policies of our leaders have broken away a section of left wing. Today words like unity, national stage and discipline have become cheap. They are not linked to truth anymore. In noise of these slogans they have forgot that today it is most important to have a strong—Anit-compromise policy, which can

help us attain freedom. Right wing methods and politics which binds us is no way a boon for us. If required we shall force congress that it proceeds on the path of struggles."

"Today the form of our struggle is against Imperialism. Our main aim at this time is—end of imperialism and then people of India shall be able to enter into new era and our struggle shall be based on socialism. Today only that person is true leftist who is ready to fight without any compromise. One who wants to fight after negotiating with the imperialism is in no way a leftist. On second level of our struggle socialism shall be the definition. But today forces against imperialism and Left wing are synonym to each other. The problem of the time is, either India shall remain in control of Right wing or under Left Wing."

"If there is any agreement with the imperialism then left wing members will have to fight not just against the imperialist but also against their new Indian friends. Swami Sahajanand has made a clear announcement and it's our duty to fulfil it with whatever resources we have. Through this meeting we should convey a warning for the imperialist and their new Indian friends. Success of this meeting shall result in death of those compromising with imperialism."

Subhash wanted that all type of left wing parties should unite under the banner of Forward Block and move firmly against the imperialist policies, but some people were in confusion while others sympathised with Gandhiji. Congress socialists leaders tilted and switched over to Gandhi-Nehru-Patel Congress who were in favor of compromise with imperialism. This was the predicament.

By National Front, Subhash meant, was Communist Parties whose party magazine was named National Front and who considered industrialists as the nationals and forming a national front union with them and their representatives and considered it essential to consider Gandhiji as the national leader. In first

phase according to Subhas, struggle shall be only against imperialism and in second phase new leadership, new stage and Socialism shall be talked about. This view was supported by M. N. Rai of Radical Party. In Swamiji's view in place of National Front and National Leader, Left front and left leader like Subhash Bose in place of Gandhiji should be considered as National Leader. Nehru was against leadership of Subhash. He was closer to Gandhiji and was not in favour of Movement against imperialism. (Suniti Ghosh, British Raj, Big Bourgeoisie of India). He was for compromise.

Jaiprakash was a weak and dualistic person. He was also with Swamiji and was also under influence of Nehru. Ultimately he ended up with Gandhiji. In the name of discipline Subhash Bose and Swamiji were already expelled from Congress. M. N. Rai, P. C. Joshi and Jaiprakash did not participate in the concluding events and protest due to fear of disciplinary action. If left wing would have remained united then surely a strong revolution would have started as desired by Subhash and Swamiji, but what happened and the result both were contrary. Jai Prakash and M.N. Roy were oscillating and in doldrum and ultimately switched over to Gandhi.

Waiting till 1942 for revolution proved out to be a delay and Subhash in his enthusiasm of patriotism left the country to ask help from Anti-Britisher Japan. Swamiji got enraged on Subhash on the issue of Japanese support as Japan was also an imperialist. It was suicidal to believe on them as it happened with the revolutionary of Burma Aung song. Subhash Bose might would have required to fight Japanese after driving out British and as that revolutionary Aungsang had fought. But communist leaders of those times could not correctly estimate Subhash and are now accepting their mistake. Revolutionary of Burma fought with British as well as Japanese and died in the last. Subhash was in no way less than them. Meaning hereby that the leadership

of the country was divided and there was confusion all round. Subhash's defeat ultimately resulted in defeat for left wing. There were many dedicated workers in left wing but opportunism of leaders, intention to be in media and personal motives created a hostile situation for Sahajanand and Subhash. This can be called as strange behaviour for so called Socialists and Marxists.

The wave of revolution in 1940 in Ramgarh's Anti-compromise and national leader Meeting led the peasant council to its topmost form which we recognize in the form of demands for nationalism, abolishing of all forms of exploitation, Demand for Complete Independence etc. This was the result of increased awareness amongst farmers and their joint efforts. Now farmers were united, organized, dedicated and full of awareness, this was the true outcome of these struggles. Farmer's son were serving in Army, Mills and as Students. Thus agitation amongst the farmers was visible in many fields. This agitation prepared the backdrop of the August revolution of 1942. Thus it is correct to say that it was the wave of peasant movement which gave strength to the national struggle against imperialism. In January 1940 *Chingari* Magazine published from Gaya was shut down. On 13th March 1940 *Dayalu* book was seized and "Bagi" was banned. In April books like *Rastriya Ladai aur Kishan*, *Akhiri Dhava ka Mauka A gaya hai*, and *Ramgarh Prastav* and *hamara kartavya* were also seized. Editor of *Janta*, *Rambriksh Benipuri* was sentenced for a year on 13th May 1940. Many books of *Heeralalpanit* and *Darshnik* were seized. In the beginning of July *Rastriya Geetanjali* was also seized. *Vishwanath Prasad Mathur*, *Dayanand Jha*, *Vinod Bihari Mukherjee* and *Shatrughan Sharan Singh* were arrested in case of conspiracy. *Basawan Singh* was imprisoned for 2.5 years for his speech against war. On 18th April 1940, *Ramnandan Mishra* was arrested from *Laheria Sarai*. *Dhanrajpuri* was arrested on 29th April 1940. *Sheelbhadr Yaji* was arrested on 16th May 1940,

Shri Page, Dhanraj Sharma* and Yogendra Shukla were also arrested. All arrested persons in 1940 were either connected with Swamiji, Subhas, Kisan Sabha or national revolutionary Parties. No one were Gandhites. So it is more appropriate to say that "Quit India" was started in 1940 by Sahajanand-Subhash and other similar revolutionaries. Gandhiji sent an order to the Provincial congress to give a personal form to the satyagrah which meant this:

1. District Collector shall be informed about the place, time and method of Satyagraha.
2. Civil disobedience shall be done personally. Many people shall not do it collectively. Civil Disobedience is not meant to be mass civil disobedience.
3. Satyagrahi on being arrested shall continue to move. There is no danger in it, no expenses involved and this is effective. There is no need to argue on it.

(Bihar Ke Swatantra Andolan, K. K. Dutta, page 372).

Shri Krishna Singh was the first Satyagrahi in Bihar. Other were:

1. Sharangdhar Singh MLC, 2. Punyadev Sharma MLC,
3. Jagat Narayan Lal MLA, 4. Ramayan Prasad MLA,
5. Kumar Kalika Singh, King of Giddaur.

Thus Gandhi restricted and limited the upsurge against Empire.

Shri Krishna Singh was released on 26th August 1941. Jaiprakash was released from Hazaribagh jail on 28th November 1940. He immediately after his release met Acharya Narendra Dev, Gandhiji in Wardha and Subhash Bose in Kolkata. He was again arrested in Bombay. He was accused of secretly sending papers to members of terrorist outfits in jail such as

* Dhanraj Sharma was main organizer of Anti compromise conference of 19 March 1940 conference Presided by Subhash.

Hindustan republican front and Congress Socialist party. It is apparent that Jai Prakash group had triple connections, with Yogendra Shukla group, Gandhiaites and socialists. Gandhiji openly tried to defend him. Ultimately he abandoned Sahajanand-Subhash group and switched over to Gandhi-Nehru leadership betraying class struggle and struggle for total, complete independence. .

OPPOSING THE GOVERNMENT

Awadh Bihari Rai of Left front started personal satyagrah in Buxar, Lambodar Mukherjee in Pakur, Usharani Mukherjee in Santhal Paragana, and Swami Sacchidanand in Patna city. They said: "They had whole India with them and they were committed to attain freedom." Peasant meeting was held in Dumurav on 8-9 March 1941. Congress socialist tried to take over the provincial peasant council here, but were unsuccessful. They formed another peasant council under inspirations from Jaiprakash and made Rambriksh Benipuri its leader number two. In Bedaul session in 1943, Narendra Dev was appointed the National head. But they were all philosophical and academic fighter and not actual fighters. They had interactions with workers just for the formality. With the result, peasant council of socialists remained on papers. Regional Student Union's councillor was arrested under India Protection Act on 4th December 1940. Abdul Bari said in student council meeting on 12-14 April 1941:

In the world's history old values are being replaced by new values and structure of society and government is changing rapidly. No force in the world can stop it.

On his 80th Birthday on 14th April 1941, Poet Ravindra Nath Tagore gave a message:

I do not have any kind of respect for the civilization which believes in governance through demolition and which do not believe in independence for all. By depriving Indians of their freedom, British have closed all the paths of our development.

In between this the demon of exploitation has unmasked himself and is presenting himself to unleash the destruction. On the other end hatred is polluting the environment. Spirit of violence which was till now hidden in the western philosophy is coming up and is polluting the human soul". It is to be recalled that Tagore had returned his title of "Sir" after massacre of Jalianawala Bagh but Gandhi neither returned his title of 'Kaisare Hind' bestowed by Empire. (K. K. Dutta, Bihar Swatantra Sangram Ka Itihaas, Page 400).

Subhash Chandra Bose escaped from his house arrest in January 1941. At Mangal Talab rally in Patna City on 10th April 1941, Ganesh Singh expressed his faith in the leadership of Swamiji and Subhash Bose. Meeting was headed by Swami Sacchidanand of Darjeeling. India resisted the speech given by British PM Churchill in the House of Commons on 9th September 1941 favouring Imperialism. Anger which was checked by force was about to blast and country was ready for it. Japan's victory also created a sense of fear amongst the ones who favoured British rule. With the onset of 1942 leaders started taking up roles and people became aware of their rights and identified their duties. Political forces were about to be dragged by them. Fear from imprisonment resulted in loss of respect amongst people. Bihar's Sadakat Ashram's Congress men underwent huge changes in caste structure identification. Rajendra Prasad's supporters who were from towns and cities were fearing from stick charge and jail and were moving out of struggle. The number of leaders from farmers and labours were

increasing day by day because they didn't fear blow of sticks and jail journey and were now enlightened. Now moderates were also sending applications to Gandhiji to allow them to participate in the struggle. Now satyagrah was also ready to break personal limits. Following was published in Bihar Satyagrah daily:

Wall of Sand has sunken

Only one more stroke is needed

Let's, come and participate in force of that stroke

This was the sign of collective Satyagrah. Intentions to keep Satyagrah under control became need of time for Zamindar, Maladar (richman). They and their representative with draw the satyagrah always when it reached peak because of far of impending dominance of poor.

Gandhiji saw solution to India's problems through social reforms and Charkha. Bringing changes in the basic arrangement of the social structure was not part of his programme but included allowing lower caste people to enter the temples, abolishing untouchability, ending purdah system etc. only. Varanashram was the root cause of caste system. Without breaking caste system abolishing untouchability was not possible. Without hitting on Zamindari system and Fake Vedanta, it was not possible to end forced labour and free labour class belonging to Harijan. Without hitting a stroke on superstitions and fake religious practices it was impossible to invoke confidence and initiate the task of social reform. It was not possible to rise up without enlightenment of the lower section. Without participation of farmers, attaining freedom was not possible and this could have been attained only through abolishing Zamindari system and changing farming structures. Ambedkar, Swamiji and Acharya Narendra Dev had huge differences with Gandhiji on these issues. Gandhiji didn't found

it right to evaluate various financial relations in the society till end. He feared that this would invoke sectional fights and would demolish the rule of privileged class. Subhash Bose considered complete Independence as his aim instead of colonial freedom. On the behavioural front Acharya Narendra Dev, Pt. Nehru and Jaiprakash favoured Gandhiji on this question. Thus India continued its relation with Viceroy, Commonwealth, English Language, Foreign Investment and governance system of imperialists. Subhash raised the question 'What kind of Swaraj?' Swamiji raised 'for whom is this Swaraj for?' For Zamindars or farmers? For Industrialists or Labours? When the society is divided into sections then the question is which class has attained Swaraj? Gandhiji didn't consider these points valid and emphasised only on freedom. For Ambedkar independence was not the first priority. For Sampurnanand and Narendra Dev, it was more a question of Academics. Subhash wanted end of imperialism in one or two instalments. Swamiji wanted it in one go. He was not in favour of instalments. Even after differences in their degrees Swamiji, Subhash and Acharya Narendra Dev were nearer to Marx had faith of nationalism and were spiritual by heart. For Narendra Dev Marxism was academic, for Sahajanand it was for practice. All the three were National from core of heart but its degree was intense in Subhash whereas Swamiji was more influenced by soviets, class struggle and internationalism. All the three were religious and were against superstitions. Inspite of difference on character changes of second world war when Germany attacked Soviet Russia, Subhash and Sahajanand were close to each other and had respect for each other and respected each other from core of heart. But, Narendra Dev switched over and went close to Gandhi and Nehru where as Subhash and Sahajanand never believed. Gandhi from latter half of decade of 1930. This is why when Sarat Chandra Bose died in 1950, Swami Sahajanand

was made head of coalition of eighteen left parties whose main stem was Forward Block founded by Subhash. He became its head on 21st Feb. 1950 as President of United Socialist Party. But he died soon on 26 June 1950. After his death coalition of 18 parties disintegrated. He was antithesis of Gandhi. Gandhi constantly used religious symbolism in politics, favoured zamindars and took retrograde *steps to hamper liberal* thinking. He always furthered the British policy of divide and rule. He lured Nehru and his stooge like group recognized as congress socialist party to weaken the Kisan Movement. He alienated the Muslim by beating the drum of Ram Raj and alienated Jinnah like Muslims by indulging in Khilafat Movement.

Swami Sahajanand Saraswati had solemnly resolved to constitute India into a sovereign socialist secular democratic republic by capture of state power through militant mass uprising and mass awkening and to secure all its citizens:

- (a) Social, political and economic justice.
- (b) Freedom of thought, speech, expression, belief faith and worship, state will have no role in religions sphere and Religion will be kept a part from state. There will be no more shouting of " Ram Rajya".
- (c) Equality in every walk of social life.
- (d) Dignity and identity of individual will be preserved and secured.
- (e) Unity and integrity of Mat ion will be assured.
- (f) Change in social, political, economic structure of society should be fundamental, total abrupt and sudden and ruling classes should be replaced by oppressed exploited classes.

PEASANT COUNCIL AND INDIAN POLITICS

Fundamentals of socialism were not beyond the understanding of Indian System, but in modern form it came from outside only and was called scientific socialism. Few wanted to keep it concentrated on Marx or Stalin or Mao or Roja Luxemburg or Laski or Planekhob or Gramsci or Che. On these basis there were different groups of socialists like Lohia, M. N. Rai, P. C. Joshi, Randive, Jaiprakash and Nehru. Swamiji along with Subhash Bose and Acharya Narendra Dev wanted to align socialism in the Indian ways to make it also a source for Independence. Hard-core Marxist considered it an alteration in the Marxism and it was not acceptable for them. Swamiji believed in Vedanta without any suspirations and he was comfortable with making it public. To prove his point he authored *Geeta Hridaya* which says that so many views of Vedanta are in line with Marxism. And Geeta has the ability to include Marxism in itself. This was the new language of Vedanta and Politics. Making Geeta as the source to empower the sectional class struggle was a new experiment in politics. Sampurnanand and Achyut Patvardhan were not clear about the concept of Vedantic Socialism and sectional and class struggle was absent in their thesis. For Jaiprakash and Lohia it was unclear due to continuously changing revolutionary environment and was blurred also due to Gandhi factor. But Gandhism was not applicable and suitable to Swamiji, Subhash and Acharya Narendra Dev. They had the action plan and intentions for changing the Indian social system in lines

with nationalism and Marxism and occasionally using violence in case of its requirement over Non-violence. Swamiji was strong on the front of sectional class struggle while Subhash and Narendra Dev were strong on nationalism. Narendra Dev wanted to first get rid of curse of being under British. He was in agreement with Gandhiji on this. He used to raise voice against all type of exploitations but didn't have the time to actively work on it. His duty as a teacher and preacher was a barrier in this but unlike Gandhiji he was not limited to reforms only. He had concrete plans to invoke awareness amongst the mass and he continued to work on this as per his capabilities till the end but he remained academic. Swamiji and Subhash were full time activists and both were ideologue also. Both were more in favour of fighting it in real than in academic spheres only. Their works were well connected with the warmth and sense of the people. Narendra Dev did not dare to cross the line marked by Gandhi. He had read Marx, praised Marx but did not practice it in real class struggle but he preached Marxism openly and this was his limit.

Swamiji and Subhash were product of continuously changing circumstances and their principle were in line with those changes. Revolutionary circumstances were present in 1940, what was needed was efforts. Both thought that Gandhiji was demolishing these efforts. While trouble for British and anger amongst farmers was an opportunity for Gandhiji to test the ethics but he preferred appeasement to ruling class. Swamiji and Subhash saw it as an opportunity against British and Zamindars. Gandhiji had deep basic differences with Subhash and Swamiji. Acharya Narendra Dev didn't believe in achieving socialism through adventure, conspiracy, media coverage and violence. He had differences with Jaiprakash, Nehru and Lohia on these issues. He didn't see a victory of socialism and independence until farmers were given a share in governance. He said as regional head of Uttar Pradesh committee:

"People can be prepared to actively participate in the national struggle by linking their economic struggle to the struggle against the imperialism". In spite of this formulation he was not active in Kisan Movement actually and directly. It was symbolic only for him. He did not cross the line drawn by Gandhi-Nehru combine opportunity provided by world war was lost.

Bihar Congress was not in agreement with his views. The influence of farmers continues to rise in congress. Movements of congress gained momentum due to increased farmer participation. But Swamiji and Subhash were not just satisfied with only participation of farmers and role in governance, instead they wanted to take it to the extreme—they wanted their full control in governance. This extreme steps were not acceptable to Narendra Dev. For him the limit of peasant movement were limited. He didn't wanted to see peasant revolution cross the lines of congress and spread across. He wanted to keep tricolour as the symbol for all this. But Swamiji and Subhash wanted red flag as their symbol for class organizations. In this way India's story of peasant struggle is short but full of suspense and turnarounds serpentine and full of ups and downs thus transforming it into an interesting, motivating and a source for future movements and is path finder still, today.

Swamiji, Subhash were in concurrence on definition of Revolution. They agreed that:

Changing the basic structure of society and transfer of governance from one class to another is revolution.
Abolishment of all social evils is the objective of revolution.

(Sandarbh, Kranti and Sanyukt Morcha by Sahajanand, Subhash's articles in Jan Garjan and Narendra Dev, Publication Division, p. 75)

Swamiji was a strong person who followed principles. He was creator of circumstances and also the organizer. He raised

the awareness amongst the peasants and took it to the extreme heights. Like Lenin, Swamiji and Narendra Dev didn't consider conspiracy and terrorism as a part of revolution. Subhash, Swamiji considered violent means only when non-violence failed to meet its objectives. Their understanding of Marxism was not influenced by the orthodoxy of Marxists. All of them favoured a united front for farmers and its widespread. They didn't like dependence on situation. This decreases the revolutionary spirit in an individual. They welcomed the economic independence as well as personal freedom along with ability to take united decisions for changing the present situation. They emphasised on the long term ethics, discipline, humanitarian feelings and sympathetic feeling towards oppressed and down-trodden. All three of them were involved in finding sensible sources for values, protecting individual as well as national image and propagating world peace and global vision. They tried to give Marxism a native form and tried to establish co-ordination with nationalism and religions. They saw Marxism and Vedanta in its transforming and welfare form against stagnation and orthodoxy. They believed that it is the changing nature of a principle that keeps it alive. The difference amongst them was that Narendra Dev was more academic while Swamiji was a combination of masses and humanitarian feel and was an activist. Natural signs of leadership were present in Swamiji. Subhash proceeded on the path of rebellion while Swamiji on the path of mass awareness and uprising. All three of them were against unnecessary violence. They believed in moving ahead on revolutionary path in ethical manner. Nehru was Laski's' Fabien, favouring his own socialism. He didn't wanted to achieve governance through rebellion and pure ethical means or through mass uprising. After 1946, Nehru proceeded on the path of introducing more and more on planning based policies initiated by Subhash where as Lohia and Jaiprakash

moved on the path of unplanned development which resulted in empowerment of Collectors in the name of Panchayat and thus anti-people men got established in politics in the name of caste and power. India could learn a lot from success of Japan, Germany, China, Turkey and France. For this the direction shown by Subhash, Swamiji and Narendra Dev can be very helpful. It will help sourcing development in the country itself. Vivekananda dragged the idealism to the verge of materialism. Swamiji dragged it to the center of the storm. The seed of Indian ways which was sown by Swami Dayanand Saraswati, which was nourished by Tilak and which took initial shape in the presence of Vivekananda turned into a full grown tree under the influence of Swami Sahajanand and Subhash. It is sorrowful that his progressiveness was not accepted by radicals nor his religiousness was accepted by Marxists. Foreign educated middle class alienated itself from this sense. As a result Swamiji was made the mummy of the Indian history and conspiracy was moulded against him and his viewpoints. The rise of a national leader was murdered by opponents by attaching localization, caste and sectarian politics for blocking class struggle. Swami was a peasant revolutionary, not just a peasant propagator. He considered peasant revolution as the main motivating force and was a social revolutionary who desired to unite sections of the producers to form a united front against appropriators. He was against ones who cheated with the resources. He was not evaluated properly.

Bhagwati Singh has described the interesting hot words but soft actions' policies of communist in his book published on Narendra Dev on page no. 121 : "In a dramatic manner Mahaveer Tyagi* entered into the room of Venkatesh Narayan.

* Mahaveer Tyagi was out spoken, bold, honest and frank leader of congress who never hesitated in opposing the wrong. He was Minister of Defence in Nehru govt. but resigned as he dissented with Nehru. He was deserter.

Mahaveer Tyagi was of clear character. He was also in Nehru's cabinet and was seldom accused of any thing and was also non-experimental. It was due to this nature he had to resign from cabinet. He said:

"I entered into room by mistake where Narendra Dev and Sampoormanand were discussing on socialism. I thought I should gain something by sitting amongst them. In the beginning I was not able to understand few parts but as the discussion continued their definitional knowledge went out of scope of my understanding. They were using large words against each other. None of them was giving other a chance to have some rest. Getting up all of a sudden from a meet of scholars is also a kind of disrespect for them. I was astonished to see their discussion getting deeper. I was like a grain in the mill which gets crushed from both ends and has no way out." Sampurmand and Narendra Deo both had read Marx, understood, but did not execute it in action. They were limited to academism only, devoid of class struggle.

On hearing this, Tiwariji burst into laughter. He said who told you to go there. This is the aforesaid direction of intellectual discussion of socialist and communists. Their discussion are boring. Since they are not connected to the mass they discuss and fight amongst themselves. Swamiji was sphere-head person. May it be socialism, issue concerned with masses or scientific socialism, learning from Tolstoy or Stalin or Roja Luxemburg or Hitler, discussing on these things was absurd to Swamiji. These discussion often were like deviating from real issues. Swamiji used to get angry on this. This was the reason why he did not accepted membership of any other party after being expelled from congress. He wanted to see peasant council as the independent council leading the political parties and activists in the national struggle against imperialism. Congress,

socialists, Forward Block and communist party, all wanted to keep Peasant Council as a supportive wing as their mass organisation under their control. Swamiji fought on this issue and that was the reason of him being a singular. At last in 1948-50 he became head of 18 left parties. He helped these groups in forming a coalition. He became head of united socialist organisation of India on 21 Feb, 1950. He expired on 26 June 1950. Lt. General Mohan Singh became its third President afterwards. Saratchandar Bose was its first President in 1949 (Source, Mymer Weiners's book).

Tilak and Malviya were result of ancient native traditions while Nehru was from new anglicized elite traditions. Gandhiji unlike Tilak didn't deeply studied the Indian culture and nor was as modern and well read as Nehru. But Subhash and Narendra Dev were product of ancient traditions and were taught in modern education, meaning they were golden combination of both tradition and change. Sahajanand didn't attended a university level education. He knew various languages and all he learned was from his efforts and life's struggle. He learned through discussions, communicating with others by engaging in interactions and it was on this basis he was able to polish his understanding of Marxism. But he did all this in his own manner. He was clear about Marxism as well as he understood the urban left wing members. He was a true Vedantic and Marxist in Indian context. This was the reason, orthodox of both schools hated him. They fought only for a limited section through Marxism. Their way of discussion as orthodox elements was not argumentative. They defined history from a narrow point of view. Marx's argumentative, materialistic and historical methods were of no importance to them. That why they were not true Marxist. Swamiji had immense faith in Indian methods too. He was able to find sense of Marxism in Geeta. His understanding of Geeta was diverse. His *Geeta*

Hridaya is not a Marxist treatise but it praises Marxism for worldly affairs. Marxism was just a source of materialism which could only satisfy humanly needs but cannot provide satisfaction to the concepts of soul, heart and sense of life. Time proved it that Swamiji was right. He was of fierce nature without compromise. His works, articles and thoughts reflected the pain of common man's pain. The cause of his dis-satisfaction was that parties were involved in their pity gains and viewed policies from narrow point of view. He never allowed peasant council to become a source for political parties benefit. He was uncompromising fighter. His voice was strong and his writing skills was open and direct and his thoughts were like a revolutionary visionary, like a philosopher and argumentation was well developed. Happiness for majority was his primary quote for the welfare of those sections of the society. Swaraj and uprising of all were fake words for him if not combined with struggle. Swaraj of Farmer and wages for the producer class was real uprising for him. He was fighting for those who were producing resources and not for one who were exploiting it. He had a clear vision and method. His motive for fighting were clear and so was the destination, aims, source and battle-field. Village was the battle field, welfare of peasants and labour was his motive. There was no conflicting thoughts in his mind. He wrote in an editorial of his book "Memory of Kisan Sabha". "Peasant Council alongwith labour section shall participate jointly for capture of state power in the struggle". Role of lower middle class was also important in the revolution for socialism in India. Indian industrialist wanted automatic abolition of Zamindari for two reasons. First because it would end Zamindar's hegemony and their dominance and second in the form of business opportunity that will come up after zamindari abolition in the form of loans, shares and partnership which will help in rise of industrialist in India. Ending Indian

Imperialism and feudalism partially was the chief motive of these industrialists. For this TATA, Goenka, Birla, Bajaj and Dalmiya used to openly donate to the socialist parties so that Partially socialists may assist Indian bourgeoisie in lowering the dominance of King, Zamindar and Nawabs. Abolition of Zamindari was necessary for Indian bourgeoisie. After abolition Zamindar invested his money in business. This facilitate growing of capitalism in India. At that time, Indian capital and capitalists were weak. After abolition of princely state and after abolition of Zamindari the dominance of feudal lords diminished. Their capital was invested in economy which in turn helped in development of capital and capitalist in India. Congress socialists helped the mill owners in this endeavour. Tata supported Nehru, Bajaj, Piti and Mohan Meakings supported Lohia, Birla, Goenka, Murarka supported Jai Prakash. Thus congress socialists and its mentor Nehru were helped in politics by Indian Big bourgeoisie. This was the ridle (Paheli) of Congress Socialist Party. This was the reason of their leader's oscillation, doldrumness and switchover to Gandhi and his ism. Thus in the first phase there was no conflict between socialism and industrialization. It is after question of distribution that the conflict starts and society and owner fight for the supreme right. Big industrialist understood this and thus they didn't faced issues in aligning with the Indian pseudo socialists. Source of Indian constitutional leaders was wealthy class but principles were based on poor only in name. Poors are the most depressed and lowermost section of the society. Middle and Upper class uses caste as a means to snatch the resources. Swamiji who was a caste free and wealth free person, found it easier to link to poor and farmers. Poor section is the one which is most revolutionary and dedicated. Resourceful person do not want inconvenience, thus, they fear going to jail and getting beaten. Poor farmers have stable thoughts. They are most

trustworthy and reliable. Current circumstances taught Swamiji to gain in himself confidence and to develop a confidence in poor. Swamiji was also unique in these terms amongst all socialist and left wing. He was not proficient in chatting and whatever he wrote was for the purpose of struggle. He never wrote to be included in the category of the great writers or philosophers. He adopted writing and oratory only to speed up the revolution. By developing an alternative direction against the Indian parliamentary and non-Parliamentary politics he made Peasant Council different in terms of language, shield, approach and methods. Peasant issues became the center of discussion in the decade of 1930 in the Indian History—all credited to Swami Sahajanand and steps initiated by him which rose cognizance and awareness in the farmers. He never oscillated and compromised with exploiters. He analysed and exposed the rural exploitative structure. He identified the most revolutionary class, the poor peasants, for which status in impending revolution, he fought with orthodox communists in his struggle. He used theology for propagation of desi Marxism and class struggle. He was unique in this respect. He fought communists on question of status of poor kisan in impending Revolution. He was in favour if equality for kisan at par with proletariat. He was in favour of class alliance of Kisan and Mazdoor. The communist party preferred party alliance and aligned with Gandhi-Nehru combine. Swami Ji was a fierce orator, investigator and articulator. He investigated the kisan problem, its misery and exploitation and exposed the oppressive system of cultivating society and middle men. He found the ways and means to end the exploitation and change the system basically, structurally. He was unique and supery, both was a peasant ideologue as formula for and as activist.

SWAMIJI'S LITERATURE

Swami Sahajanand wrote following literary material on the plight of farmers at the erstwhile era: the subject discussed over:

1. Kranti Kya Hai?
2. Kishan Kaun Hai?
3. Khet Mazdur Kaun Hai?
4. Jharkhand Ke Kishan?
5. Khet Mazadoor.
6. Sanyukt Morcha Kya Hai?
7. Rashtriya Morcha Ka Bhram Kya Hai?
8. Ab Kya Ho?
9. Sangharsh ke Do Morche Kya Hai?
10. Bhumi Vyavastha Kaisi ho?
11. Kishano Ke Daave Kya Hai?
12. Karyakram Ke, Khareete Kya Hai?
13. Sanyukth Samajwadi Sabha ke Karyakram Kya Hai?
14. Sanyukth Kishan Sabha Ke Karyakram Kya Hai?
15. Maharudra Ka Mahatandav Kya Hai?

In the above subjects, Swamiji used his understanding of the peasant problems ails and ailments which has been published in 6 parts as 'Swami Sahajanand Rachnawali' from Delhi Prakashan Sansthan. Edition on this work was done by the author himself. This narration is result of his hard work of 25 years. I had to visit thousands places, meet thousand people, collect the material and had to verify the provided information at many Instances by cross check. I had to read 30 years old

books, newspapers and related literature, had to understand them and had to face altercations in discussions and conversations. This material is result of all this struggle which highlights the different spheres of Swamiji's Life with marking the situation at the erstwhile era.

SWAMIJI IN LITERATURE

Swamiji was such committed, enlightened figure who showed path to many individuals, lost in the maze of politics. With fast changing society, poets, authors and narrators were finding it hard to cope up with the changes and as a results a new form of poems, narrations and articles were coming up in the field of literature. Dinkar, Benipuri, Renu, Rahul, Nagarjun, Yashpal etc. were product of such upheaval. There is a long list of literates associated with Swamiji. In 1936, Agyaey was in peasant front in Meerut. In 1938, Prabhakar Maachve was also on Peasant front in Baghpat and in 1939 famous English literate Mulk Raj Anand in Tripuri (Jabalpur) was also with Swamiji. Bijnour's Pt. Padam Singh Sharma, Pt. Bechan Sharma from Mirzapur-Varanasi, Wife of famous revolutionary Manmathnath Gupta, Maya Gupta, all these were active in peasant front. Mahasweta Devi has envisioned Swamiji in her novel *Agnipath* and even a strong oppose of Swamiji, Raja Radhikaraman from 'Suryapura Estate' has paid his respect to Swamiji by writing *Daridyanarayan*. Swamiji was honorary for all, friends and foes, due to his honesty, diligence, zest for peasant welfare, dedication and hard work. But due to his rigid, untidy, uncompromising attitude, he was also a source of fear and criticism for his foes. Uncompromising Swamiji was punished for it either in form of abuse or conspiracy of silence. The acknowledgement which Swamiji and his close associate literates Rahul Sanskratayan, Dinkar*,

* Dinkar was a national poet of peasant revolution. He hailed from Begusarai (Bihar). Gradually he came near to Nehru, J.P. Lohia and lastly to Gandhism.

Rambriksh Benipuri, Nagarjuna, deserved, were never accredited. Isn't it unfortunate that country does not have an institute in the name of Rahul or Benipuri, looking at their's supportive sacrifice. On 29 December 2014, Times of India has published a report the some family members of Subhas Chandra Bose have sought intervention of the R.S.S. in the declassification of secret files, held by the Central Govt on the disappearance of the supermost freedom fighter. Several members of the family met to R.S.S. functionary Indresh Kumar to impress upon him the need to declassify the files on Netaji. The move followed the Narendra Modi government's refusal to release the total secret files many of which are about Netaji's disappearance as did the previous Governments , citing possible adverse impact on relation with other nations. Several concerned files were destroyed in past.

Justice Mukherjee head of one man Commission of inquiry set up by the Atal Bihar Government also noted in his report that:

the documents held by the government of India were not made available to him and that this had hampered his quest for the truth in the disappearance.

This provides ample scope for doubting about the genuinity of all government's intentions. Subhas Chandra Bose disappeared in Agust 1945 on a flight from Formosa (Taiwan). Family members believe Netaji born in 1897, is alive and they rejected posthumous Bharat Ratna in 1992 as well. Netaji has not been seen for almost seventy years, his admirers believe that he will surface one day. It generates excitement in certain parts of the country. His supporters believe that Nataji stature is above the discredited Bharat Ratna which has been conferred to underserving personalities even to those who were supporters of British Raj and were awarded by titles of "Sir".

An award for the iconic leaders like Netaji and Sahajanand would have been in line with the idea of recognizing leaders outside the Gandhi- Nehru political lineage.

The government should have taken this opportunity to ensure a fair and transparent action and declassify the so called remnant secret papers. Subhash along with Sahajanand was forces of modern progress for masses whereas Gandhi represented premodern, Pre-empire forces of premodernism based on myths and revisionists theory whereas Nehru was a clever enough manaeuverer to keep himself in between to appease both comprador capitalism and empire. He provided infrastructure to comprador capitalists in the name of socialism and dominated the scene. Would this not be termed neglect of sacrifice and narrow thinking of ruler parties. Rahul has written a book on Swamiji named *Naye Bharat Ke Naye Neta* and he has recalled it in his biography also with respectful terms such as India's Great Peasant Guru, Vedic scholar and dedicated peasant fighter. Since Rahul himself was neglected, his scriptures are read in limited numbers. Benipuri and Rahul were continuously under the supervision and guidance of Swamiji from 1920 to 1945. Their literature on peasant were highly inspired from him. Benipuri in his scripture 'Meri Dristhi' has recalled Swamiji wholeheartedly, in spite of the fact that he developed differences with Swamiji since 1940 which were often exposed. Benipuri was the editor of the magazine *Yogi* which was named on Swamiji. He was also the editor of Magazines published under supervision of Swamiji *Lok Sangrah* and *Janta*. *Janta*'s editorial team also had Jai Prakash Narayan. Rahul was the editor of *Hunkar* Magazine till 1945. Swamiji had to remove Rahul as editor and Indradeep Sinhas as Co-editor due to wrong publication on Jaiprakash and Subhash. This event still act as a sting to former MP Indradeep Babu. Rahul was of larger heart—he kept quiet. He was a trusted aid of Swamiji and thus kept silent on the differences. A small piece

of faith was heavier than point of difference. Ram Dayal Pandey was Co-editor of Janta and Benipuri was Editor. Wife of Revolutionary Manmathnath Gupta, Maya Gupta, was writer in Hunkar. Ram Dayal Pandey was also associated with Hunkar. Awadh Bihari Suman became assistant editor latter on. Rahul was card holder of C.P.I. but was on false allegation around 1950.

POOR'S SANYASI

Earlier Dinkar's unique style and sharpness is entirely due to his social base of peasants, Mokama-Simri's Life threatening incident and Life long struggle of Swami Sahajanand. Dinkar has same fierceness as Swamiji had. Since Swamiji was a Sanyasi; he was more selfless and robust personality. Dinkar, due to his middle class household limitations seldom approached the surrender path. Earlier firmness in Dinkar's personality can be envisioned through Swamiji. Dinkar's fierceness continued in every way whether it was Job in British administration, MP's post due to Nehru's help or Post of VC due to help of Shri Babu or V.N. Jha. Sun is red in dusk as well as in dawn. Protagonist of 'Hunkar' and 'Kurushetra' was writing Parshuram ki Pratiksha with same enthusiasm. Enthusiasm was the soul of Dinkar's poems. Dinkar dedicated his poems to Swamiji: 'Dalito ka Sanyasi' and 'Mrityu Se Upaji Karuna'. His initial fiery writing was outcome of his background and Swami's influence. Latter on it lost its fire in due course. His intent of content and world outlook changed. He became Gandhian. He lost revolutionary fervor in last.

Rajendra Prasad in his autobiography and Mahadev Desai in 'Harijan' has mentioned a lot about Swamiji.

A.R. Desai has written many books on Swamiji and Ayodhya Singh, Sunil Sen, Sumit Sarkar, Dhangrey, Walter Hawser, Arun Kumar, Arun Kumar Rai, Renu, Rakesh Gupta, Harkishan Singh Surjit, M.A. Rasool, Kalyan Mukherjee,

Hanningham Prassan Chaudhary, Vinod Mishra, Arvind Narayan Das, Triveni Sharma Sudhakar, Kubernath Rai and Nagarjuna has written a lot about Swamiji. Nagarjuna's novel *Balachnama* is entirely based on a speech by Swamiji which has been incorporated in it. *Balachnama*'s characters are the people working with Swamiji. In this novel Ramanand Mishra's Sasural Manjhwe estate has been exactly depicted. Famous protagonist charitar karamkar of Renu's "Maila Aanchal" is Nakshatra Malakar. Kalicharan was Suraj Narayan Singh in reality. Baman Das was Swamiji and Doctor resembles with Jaiprakash. *Maila Aanchal* was tearful depiction of J. P. Lohiya and their Socialism. Suraj Narayan Singh, Siyaram Singh*, Yogendra Shukla, ** Nakshatra Malakar, all were associates of Swamiji in Peasant Struggle. Renu's *Parti pari katha* was a comment of childlessness of communist and was story of peasant struggle. Thus though Swamiji was not fully neglected from the literature but was deprived of rank he deserved due to differences with communists, negligence by communist parties. Thanks to the peasant movements across the country he was in headlines again as it became difficult to neglect the movements, Swamiji was again popular. Publication of Swami Sahajanand Saraswati Rachnawali (Prakash Sansthan, Delhi) came up as a welcome effort in this regard. C.P.I.M.L. General Secretary Vinod Mishra had recalled him in high words in Party's document. Flaming fields of Bihar.

Swamiji's literature depicts his life struggle. He was not a conscious author. Need for social and peasant struggle forced him to write and speak which resulted in his literature. Triveni Sharma Sudhakar, Ramchandra Sharma, Raghav Sharan

* Siyaram Singh was famous revolutionary of Bihar in 1942 and head of parallel govt. up to 1946 in Bhagalpur area.

** Yogendra Shukla was an associate of Bhagat Singh. He was greatest adventurist revolutionary of Bihar.

Sharma, Shyam Bihari Rai, Avdhesh Pradhan, Arvind Narayan Das, Vinod Mishra, Walter Hazzer, Sunil Sen, Dr. Dasai, Hanningham, Dhanagri, Rakesh Gupta are credited for bringing his literature into the light and it was done in a meaningful manner. In this regard, Vinod Mishra's *Bihar Ke Dadhakte Khet Khalahaan Ki dastaan* and Chandrabhushan's* *Kishan Aandloan Ka Vikas—Sahajanand Se Charu Aur Ab* are significant. Swamiji's heart, mind and hands were in sync with each other, i.e. his literature was like a kind heart, mind like a rational person and hands like a dedicated person. Source of this synchronization was revolutionary spirit developed since birth which does not allow to be stagnant. He was like Krishna who finds his own path, Fearless like Parshuram. People following traditional path cannot understand him nor would they appreciate his ways neither they can depict a true picture of Swamiji. Person narrating Baanbhatt's life has to be free like him. Baanbhatt luckily got Hazari Prasad Dwivedi and Swamiji got Kubernath Rai and Hauser who were expert in narrating biographies.

Kubernath Rai narrates a story from Hebrew Bible:

Valam encouraged by priests climbed the praying dais thrice to curse the Jews and all three times due to some divine force, he narrated blessings only. Similarly my narration also forgets its soul of unbiased criticism in front of his dedicated soul. Unwillingly but I find myself bowing before this soul. Great Poet Gete wrote about his criticizer that when Shiller talks about great poets like Homer his intelligence should be at par with Homer. Thus readers should remain assured that wherever I am stuck in difference I will adopt thinking like Swamiji and I respect his dedication and sacrifice a lot. He was like an enlightened fire which

* Chandra Bhushan and Nishant was nickname of Raghav Sharan Sharma while he was active supporter of militant Kisan Movement during 1980's. Nishant was his secret party name in Varanasi.

helped people to find paths even in the ancient times. Similar views were expressed by Mahashweta in "Agnigarbh" about Swami Ji.

Swamiji changed his ways with the changing circumstances of the peasant movement by adopting changed issues, programmes and verticals in his working which transformed into a mass struggle. In his novel *Balachnama* Nagarjuna has depicted a speech of Swamiji given in north eastern Bihar. This place is near Khalauji. Swamiji was a short statured man with medium complexion, clothes were of Gerua colour. Swamiji said:

"Don't trust outsider leaders, choose your own leaders. I have observed many outsiders, they do nothing. Though they are literate and you people are illiterate but all the products are produced by you and these leaders come here to satisfy their hunger from our products. You know it through it your wisdom that a lecture cannot produce a single grain of wheat. Lecture cannot satisfy hunger or thirst. If you people can produce food why can't you produce good leader? Your own person shall understand the grievances better. All of you are millions in numbers. When you all will rise and pronounce, landlords shall tremble in fear. They are small in numbers, they act brutally not on their own power but with help of Officers. All of you just do three things: Become united in one force, don't leave your land at any cost, don't approach court, peasant council shall help you. Brothers get ready. No one shall be able to snatch our rights. Let's announce: Long Live Revolution."

He further said:

You shall get nothing by asking for it. You can get your right through your strength. What is our strength? Unity of organization is our strength.

In this novel, Radha Babu was actually Pt. Ramanand Mishra who was considered second most influential socialist after Jaiprakash. Filing nomination for Rajya Sabha was done by Jaiprakash which was rejected due to wrong entry. He wanted to fight the election for the legislative central council. Mishra was saddened by this and lost interest in politics and started living like a Sanyasi. Gauri Shankar Chaudhary was actually Vaidhnath Chaudhary who operated an Ayurvedic ashram in Poornia's Ranipatara for about 50 years. Kamendra Prasad Narayan was actually Landlord of Manjhve Estate and Brother in law of Ramanand Mishra. Lavanglata was actually wife of Ramanand Mishra, Rajkumari. This novel depicts the corruption during the earthquake in Bihar in 1934 in form of mismanagement of relief fund and how money was cheated from farmers by paying them only half of the eligibility amount. Swamiji's love for nation never deflected in spite of his international vision. He opposed Rajendra Babu's fund mismanagement. Rajendra Prasad was branded as Thagendra Prasad by Swami Ji. Swami Ji was also critical of I.P. who Shyed away with class struggle.

Books such as *Brahmrishi Vansh Vistar, Jhuta Bhay, Mithyabhimaan* and *Brahman Samaj ki Stithi and Maithil Maan Mardan* were written in the early phases when he was fighting for equal rights and social status for non-begging Brahmans, at par with the priests. These books are unique in terms of research and study. These books invoked the confidence in non-begging Brahmans and challenged haughty priests by giving examples from the scriptures. These books removed the misconceptions and fear from the mind of non-begging Brahmans and inspired them to study Sanskrit which ultimately helped in demolishing the wall between the priests and non-begging Brahmans. Thus on one hand it ended the monopoly of priests and on the other hand helped the poor farm Brahmans to reap the economic benefit, superstitions were also demolished to an extent.

Because "Karmkalap" gained acceptance as a simple scriptures approved book and thus it proved to be very useful. 'Brahmrishi Vansh Vistar' proved out to be unique in terms of self-discovery and understanding the source, identity and varieties of Brahmins. This was the beginning which invoked the peasant welfare spirit in him. Swamiji worked as a social reformer during this period which continued in some form from 1915 to 1927. Swamiji stand on Bhumihar Brahman social status was supported by Ambedkar, Suniti Kumar Chatterjee, Rahul, Hajari Prasad Dviwevdi, Baldro Upadhyay, Anugrah Narayon, Dr. Munje, Rajnath Pandey and others. He gave identity to militariseel from Brahmins.

Mera Jeevan Sangharsh is a book written by Swamiji. It has been tradition of India not to mention about their family, hereditary, place etc. This is the reason, not much is known about Valmiki, Vyas, Tulsidas, Kalidas and Kabirdas birth place or hereditary. Only Banbhat has mentioned something about his hereditary and place of birth due to his anger on some factors. Same method was adopted by Swamiji. By providing a brief description about his own life, he has provided a verified description of social life, circumstances of the era, changes taking place in the circumstances, struggle, issues, stages of political freedom, up and down of struggle etc. This is the speciality of this biography. By reading this single book one can know about the political-social circumstances of the era. This book along with being an excellent biography is also the history of its era. Akbarnama, Jahangirnama, Babarnama, Rajtarngini, Harshcharchit, Nehru's Biography are also in similar lines of being of historical evidence. Swamiji's narration is unique in many sense and is closer to the ancient Indian traditions which involves self-abstraction and evaluation as of little importance in compassion to social life.

Swaniji's narrative describes the period between death of

Tilak and expulsion and disappearance of Subhash Bose from Congress which occurred during 1919 to 1941. It elaborates practices of superstitions, looting people in name of God, means to trap farmers and conspiracies by political parties. It has less description of personal life and has more evaluation of social arrangements and happenings. Bhisma spent his entire life in nourishing his personality while on the other hand Krishna spent his life on developing social character useful for the common people. This is the reason why Bhisma has not been considered an incarnation while Krishna has been considered as one with all the skills and qualities. Social character is the actual character, personal character is the supplement to it, which gains popularity for people. Personal character is nothing in itself, actual thing is social awareness. This is elaborated through the soul of biographies. On this parameter Swamiji's biography is more influential than others. History remains strong and unbreakable for the historical person. Kubernath says in this respect:

Social character is the image of self, Swamiji's biography has an impact of his social life on the soul of the biography. Without keeping any space for his political sphere he acted not only as a witness but also expresses his thoughts, responses, anger, sympathy and sorrow on the mistakes of the colleagues. This biography clearly depicts what was the purpose of his life struggle, what was his motive and path. Swamiji's biography has a clear depiction of vision of farmers and peasant support. This was the only test for friend and foe. Swamiji's biography became epic of his life struggle and social circumstances. It does not only portrays personal likes-dislikes, social circumstances but has also commented on the impact of these arrangements, resultant learnings and future guidance available through it. This biography proceeds with evaluation of soul of scriptures,

reasons of social arrangements, bravery by revolutionaries in their claims, uprising of people and mistrust for the leaders. This biography involves debates, discussion, evaluation and conclusion in the clear way. This biography has elaborated on following questions:

1. Is it not the duty of Sanyasi to uplift the fallen ones?
2. Why Swamiji entered national politics inspite of being a Sanyasi of Nisprih Dandi from Shakar Cult.
3. Is it not an opportunity to write an epic through writing the biography more about the farmers, when you are the propagator of the revolution?
4. Is Human for debates or is any opinion is superior or humanity in altruism. Man is more important.
5. Why life transformed into revolutionary way?
6. What were changes in existing arrangements?
7. Is it not the work of scholars to find ways of religion wisely to suit common man's needs.
8. What is real and fake Vedanta?
9. What is real and fake left wing?
10. What is propelling force of nationalism? What is its place and role in impending revolution?
11. Which class is motivating force of contemporary history.

Swamiji's biography was in fact solution to these questions:

1. Uplifting the fallen as the duty of the sanyasi and thereby questioning the monopoly of the priests, fighting British for National freedom struggle, struggle with landlords for the rights of the farmers and fighting with Congress, Congress Socialists and Communist Parties on the basis of ideology and working style for the rights of farmers is the answer to the first question.
2. 'Lok Sangrah' is the second path of Sanyas other than

knowledge path. This understanding pushed him towards birth against imperialism. This principle of 'Lok Sangrah' remained the basis of his struggle throughout his life. He fought was of peasantry, war of Independence and war of liberation of peasant and labour for seizure of state power from imperialism, capitalism and seadalisim . He endiavoured not only for welfare of but for capture of state power by their organic eel strength.

3. *Mera Jeevan Sangharsh* is in fact the epic of transformation of peasant awareness to the level of peasant movement and peasant revolution.
4. Socialism, Marxism all are for the service of humanity. No doubt, Marxism is the most suitable way from the materialistic point of view. For Karuna Daya, Sambedama, feelings, emotions vedant is more applicable and suitable and Gita encompasses element of Marxism in it.

'There is no place for people like me if there is no place for religion'. It is clear that Swamiji was in favour of discovering self, he considered Vedanta as a source which could satisfy both heart and mind. Geeta's way is holistic, general, and ultimate and does not has a conflict with Marxism. Any Marxist, Christian, Muslim or a materialistic person can also be a follower of Geeta. It is a way of serving humanity. Humanity is higher than any religion, sects and paths and Geeta is a pronunciation of this. This pronunciation is the main source, and intent of Gita. Gita teaches service to mankind which is the essence of religion.

5. Swamiji's life underwent revolutionary changes while facing challenges in the path of his life struggle. This was not sudden but was gradual. It included both

humanity and resistance, both heart and mind, compassion and logic.

6. Indian Nationalism was born as a result of clash between imperialism and general public. Indian nationalism was not born out of intelligence of foreign educated elites and leaders but it was result of mass struggle. In the beginning leaders tried to help the British by taking shield of Satyagrah along with general public. After 1934 leader and Babu cadre was surprised that imperialism was failing due to the mass participation of farmers-labours-students-soldiers in the struggle. Sacrifice of Bhagat Singh and Subhash Bose's foreign departure was in same lines. On the other hand there came the need for Crisp, Cabinet mission, Vavel and Mountbatten agreements. Circumstances were undergoing changes in a quick manner. Changing circumstances lead to new ways of struggle and also revolutionary changes in the life of its main propagator. This was not a result of biased thinking, but was result of struggle throughout the life. Swamiji's changing formulas provided a speed to this process. Swamiji endeavour was resisted by Gandhites.
7. In Buddha and Shanker there is a special place for argumentative skills. Kapil's Sankya, Gautam's Nyay all had argumentative skills in high regards. In India Religion is not different from arguments and duty. Swamiji himself has placed high regards for arguments and logics in his "Geeta Hridaya". Finding a justifiable duty bound humanitarian way of religion was also a purpose of his life. He was against Nakali Vedant.
8. Serving humanity, Lok Sangrah, initiative taking spirit this is the real Vedanta. There were many forms of fake Vedanta. True spirit of religion, identifying self and serving masses was what Swamiji acknowledged and was against

the superstitions and was in favour of science.

“Our religion, discipline and fame is in the fact that we earn and eat and do not consider any work as small. Fake forms of religion can be criticized one by one and not by criticizing the religion itself”.

According to Kubernath:

“Swamiji is following religion in a much natural manner than many religious leaders and is also different from the belief that religion is like a drug.” He differed C.P.I. on it.

9. Establishment of Farmer-labour rule is true left wing strategy and ideology. Unification of left wing groups to form a group against imperialism, feudalistic and capitalism is true left wing spirit. Breaking up of left wing and becoming a devotee of congress and encouraging foreign money and seeking useless explanation is fake left wing spirit.
10. Peasants are the main propelling force of national struggle. Peasants shall be the main source of motivating force in any struggle, main task shall be peasant struggle. Peasants shall be equal partner in the struggle. Peasant council shall not be a follower of communist or any other party. Swamiji prohibited peasant council from becoming a wing of communists. He considered it a separate independent organization. It was not serviant to any parties.

Swamiji who once wrote '*Brahmrishi Vansh Vistar*' and *Karmkalap* in his early stage was not far from daily religious practices. He was saddened, indifferent and did not believed in the traditional ways of karma. He hated trade influenced practices of Dharam. Shyamnandan Mishra observes: “how many mass leaders has knowledge of such deep struggle base and how many have their

politics of such a religious basis, like Swamiji has". In Swamiji's opinion Dharma was service to mankind, service to other, not to self. Benefit of society is the essence of real religion.

GEETA HRIDAYA

In Geeta Hridaya Swamiji has originally established Shankaracharya's non-duality principle of karma. In this manner book has established a path and bridge between sanyas and karma. Swamiji clarified that this conception about Shankaracharya is wrong that he only favours knowledge path and oppose karma. Swamiji has argumentated and opposed the points presented by great scholar Bal Gangadhar Tilak on the matter. Shankaracharya's whole life was devoted to the welfare of the common mass. By leaving karma he means 'Lok Sangrah'. In spite of being a knowledgeable sanyasi Shankar roamed around for the welfare of others and spent every second in karma and his karma was not for his own benefit but for the benefit of all. This karma sanyas is considered supreme. Lok Sangrah is work of a sanyasi. Sankaracharya's whole life was devoted to Karma and gyan, simultaneously.

In whole process and from viewpoint of Swamiji's non-duality Vedanta, Tilak proves out to be wrong on understanding meaning of sanyas and karma. Question is of vision, in parts Tilak was correct when he advocates Karma practice but proved out to be wrong when seen as a whole. Swamiji well understood this fact and evaluated it a lot. Tilak's *Karmayog* was based on practability and dedication. Swamiji and Tilak both were knowledgeable personalities. The only difference was that of viewpoint. Swamiji has a viewpoint that of a sanyasi while the other had a view point of that of a household. Tilak considered karma as karma and did not attach any adjective to it while Swamiji supported adjective based karma, if karma is for 'Lok Sangrah' then only it can survive, only then sanyas shall be

stable. Service to others is the essence and intent of Gita according to Swamiji.

In *Geeta*, Swamiji has evaluated only the visible parts. He feared that if invisible parts are evaluated then readers might get stuck in the concepts of God and devotion which may lead to superstition. Like Gautam Buddha Swamiji also disliked to discuss about God. Principle of Non-Duality (Adwait) does not have different God. Swamiji's Non-duality Vedanta didn't lack space for Marxism but Marxism was only supportive to vedant's Aarth. Similarities have been shown between *Geeta* and Marxism but as per Swamiji *Geeta* was more superior and eternal. The main theme of *Geeta Hridaya* is the concept of Non-Duality (Adwait) which is above the feeling of Success and Defeat, Profit and Loss and aims at mass welfare and Lok Sangrah. *Geeta Hridaya* aims to bridge gap between vedant and Marxism. This secret is neither understood by ordinary Vedantic who consider it a Marxist literature neither the Communists. Kubernath Rai has correctly commented on *Geeta Hridaya*:

An alert reader can see that Marxism is on the edge, main thesis is Non Duality (Adwait) based Karmayog.

Within the boundaries of Non-Duality Vedanta was the Karmayog included. Thus Swamiji was propagating karma as being of common use through sanyas and on the other hand connecting Vedanta to Mass struggle and mass welfare, thereby directing them to Vedanta. Thus the gap between the Vedanta and personal karma ended through active Vedanta and mass welfare activities. *Geeta Hridaya* has evaluated Marxism but Swamiji has not laid more importance to it in front of simplicity and ethics of *Geeta*. Marxism is like a loop line in *Geeta Hridaya*. Main line is knowledge based Karmayog, Swamiji's entire life was based on Happiness for many, wellness for many. Wellness for many cannot be different from wellness for all—this

was said by Swamiji in his speech. In the struggle for mass welfare Swamiji became an activist of Wellness for many, for majority.

EARLY LITERATURE OF SWAMI SAHAJANAND SARASWATI

1. Brahman Samaj Ki Stithi
2. Bhumihar Brhaman Parichay
3. Brahmriishi Vansh Vistar
4. Jhootha Bhay Aur Mithya Abhimaan
5. Maithil Maanmardan

Above mentioned books are concerned with social caste based arrangement, sources of plight, means of improvement and self-pride. It has details of caste based insult, fear, frustration, evils of priests, struggle of society against monopoly. Swamiji never had conciliation with the higher class. In this period he was engaged in social movement of Brahman Samaj.

6. *Karmakalaap*: This book presents various Hindu rituals in an orderly and systematic manner. This book has mention of 16 rituals as a whole. Due to foolishness of priests and exploitation, Hindus were in a state of plight. Superstitions was at its height. Priests had limited knowledge and were not aware of many facts. Further they wanted that public should not pursue Sanskrit and thus, their monopoly can continue. In this way practices of observing true Hindu rituals were getting demolished. There was a lot of confusion over the methods of karmakand. Thus, people having little knowledge were not able to make use of it. Pt. Bhimsen Sharma's "Sanskar Vidhi" had a lot of shortcomings and only people with broad knowledge were able to use it. People having less knowledge and only knowing Hindi were not able to make use of it. Thus, a simple book was needed which was available in Hindi and was easy to

understand for person having zero knowledge of karma Kand was need of the hour. A method in which karma was not confusing was need of the hour. Swamiji eradicated this gap by writing Karmakalap. This book is unique in itself for its simplicity and extensiveness..

It has different ways for followers of Sam Veda and Yajur Veda and has detailed writings about astrology. Due to this book confusions about karma kand were eradicated, karma kand became easily accessible to common people and superstitions promoted by priests were removed. Peasant Brahmins started using the book in different rituals. Thus there was emergence of new priests in the society and its economic benefit were also available to the section. Then other caste were also enlightened towards the ways of worshiping and adapting the way prescribed in the book. It broke the monopoly of priest class on rituals.

Swamiji owned various skills in his personality. In the beginning there were clashes between priests and landlords in which Bhumihar Brahmins, Landlords lost their thrust and also priests became fearful of the fierce personality of Swamiji who was against their monopoly. Then he turned to peasant struggle. Swamiji was full of honesty, fearlessness and clear thoughts. He never compromised with the welfare measures of the peasants. He opposed their religious exploitation.

7. *Gaya Zile Ke Kishano Ki Karun Kahani*: This book presents an exact picture of the plight of the farmers during the first half of decade of 1930 in the state of Bihar, state of farmers, how they were exploited, faulty. It describes system of determining tax, harshness of recovery and hurting the sentiments and image of people. It's an excellent book to understand the agrarian situation prevailing at that time in Central Bihar.
8. *Bhumi Vyavastha Kaisi Ho*: Importance of eradicating

Zamindari, changes in rules in respect to heirs, limiting of land, Restrictions on increasing—decreasing the holdings, how to reduce the disguised unemployment by diverting the workforce into other means of earnings, are the topics covered in the book.

9. *Kishano ko Fasane ki Taiyyariyan*: This book tries to break the mental barriers and blockages in the farmers. This book presents a picture of mass uprising of farmers. This book has unmasked the Peasant mass meeting about how they illusionized the farmers. Swamiji had a wide experience in dealing with caste based organizations and meetings and how rich exploited and divided the farmers, how they were devoted to the service of British and the book was result of these experiences.
10. *Kishan Aandolan Kyu Aur Kya Hai*: This book has defined united front. United front shall be for the exploited ones whether they are farmers, labour, youths, students or unemployed.
11. *Kishano Ke Dost Aur Dushman*: this book was written in 1938. Swamiji has mentioned four objectives as follows: Making Lakhs of members of peasant council, Developing Peasant service group, Developing Peasant funds and popularizing *Kishan Magazine* in every household.
12. *Zamindari Ka Khatma Kaise Ho*: How to demolish the Zamindari system and providing control in the hands of actual farmers and labours. This book was released on May Day in 1946.
13. *Zamindari Kyu Utha Di Jaye*: This book was published in April 1939.
14. *Mera Jeevan Sangharsh*: Swamiji was a sanyasi. He was not selfish. He was soul of national skills and culture. He was like Shiva taking over the priests, Zamindars, officers and foreigners through service of masses by

dedication, bravery and honesty. It also has description of changing political scenarios, switching interest of political players, cunningness of leaders and bravery of public by fighting all these evils. Swamiji believed in principle of not to quit nor to back and thus create an environment of energized uprising which influenced political scenarios. *Kishan Sabha Ke Sansmaran* was published on 10 February 1947 but original book was written in 1940-41. Preface had details of dispute of Swamiji with communists and his character of holding control over the peasant council. Further it had details of language and differences with Jaiprakash. It also had details of establishment of peasant council. It mentions about peasant struggle of Macchi, Sagarpur, Simri and Bakhtiyarpur and others Nagarjuna in his novel *Balachnamahas* mentioned about this struggle.

15. *Kishan Kaise Ladte Hai*: This has collection of peasant struggles since 1928.
16. *Geeta Hridaya*: This is a unique book related to Marxism and Non-Duality a cult of vedant.
17. *Kranti Aur Sanyukt Morcha*: This is an ideological book which has called for basic changes in society and has called peasant-labour union as a front for total change and revolution.
18. *Kishan Kya Kare*: This is a general book for farmers for preparing them to fight.
19. *Jharkhand Ke kishan*: This is a literature from Hazaribagh Jail. It described about Tribal's of Jharkhand and their physical condition along with remedial measures.
20. *Khet Mazdur*: This is a literature from Hazaribagh jail in 1940-41. It advocates unity among peasants and farm labours. There is no divide line between poor kisan and mazaduar.

21. *Ab Kya Ho*: This was published on 24 August 1947 after independence.
22. *Maharudra Ka Mahatandav*: This book was written in 1948. It advocates militant Kisan Revolution for liberation of Kisan. Poor kisan has been depicted as Maha Rudra.
23. *Kishano Ke Daave Karyakram Ke Khareete*: This was written in 1949 and advocates for class struggle as main form of struggle. Parliamentary struggle is only to supplement it.
24. *Hamare Kishan Sewak* : It describes about peasant volunteers.
25. *Jung Aur Rashtriya Ladai*: This was published in February 1942. It is a debate with Subhash on ways to evict the Britishers from India advocating mass struggle.
26. *Other Side of the shield*: This was a response to Dr. Rajendra Prasad, who took side of Zamindar, and claimed that he was well wisher of peasants. Swamiji has exposed his intrigues.
27. *Rent Reduction in Bihar*: This was a comment on Bihar cabinet who falsely claimed that they are well wishers of peasantry.
28. *Mimansha Darshan*: It is a treatise on Mimansha.

“The other side of shield” and “Rent reduction in Bihar” are an exposure of anti peasant policies of Congress cabinet in Bihar. Peasant Revolution was the main theme of revolution and united front. This book has outer influence of Marxist pattern with influence from Lenin. This was a response to the communist mind-set, National Front and National Democracy from the side of Peasant council by advocating united left front and people’s democracy. Swamiji has elaborated through February Revolution of Lenin, Mao’s tactics and examples of

Marx, Lenin and Stalin to Jaiprakash, M. N. Rai, P. C. Joshi that it is their mistake to consider congress as a front against imperialism. His book is a crust of Marxism in which he appears to be finding a new way of peasant supported struggle for national struggle and establishing Kisan-Mazdoor Raj. United front should be formed from the daily wage earners and not from the salaried class which has deep relations with the farmers and the situation in which 80 percent of the population is living. Forming a united front with the villagers' base, farmers as principle force and considering the revolutionary force of public as the main superior force, was not acceptable to the communist party, congress and radical group and this book is about replacing Gandhi as national leader by left leader subhash for coming struggle against British Raj. In the book Swamiji's principle of peasant as the main force is clearly visible. Revolution and united front were not Marxism in raw form but book is written on Marxist pattern. It has a new form of Marxism through Indian, peasant's, patriotism and self-discovery which was not acceptable to the Russian followers of Marxism. This was a Desi Marxism which had nationalism, welfare of society in a strong form. Deep thinking enabled swamiji to become a friend with Marxism but not in the form of Arthodox Marxism, just as an accomplice. Swamiji wrote this book to unite the left wing through his experience, providing help to the dalits and by considering the existing actual rural scenario. But it was so unacceptable to the congress and their leftist supporters that they went into silence. Book remained away from the common public. It was not in nature of Swamiji to drop his unique style but he defeated the leftist indebate by writing in his own style. Leftists have been unable to mark the unique style of Swamiji till now and how deeply it can be used in the Indian left Politics and neither have they improved their style. On the other hand Gandhiji and Lohiya used the language in the best possible

simple manner and gained acceptability from masses. This is the reason of failure of Indian Leftists. If only they would have learned something from Swamiji, Narendra Dev, Subhash Bose and Bhagat Singh. This would not have happened due to lack of public culture leftist continued to erode their own roots. Swamiji's *Geeta* has the mind-set of the leftism and it is based on knowledge of the situation ails and their remedy and farmer's culture and farmer's viewpoint. This was a scare form of Left ideology. Indian leader influenced by Laski, Tolstoy, Ruskin, McCauley, Trotsky were against to follow such ideology in their class interest. They didn't like the traditional practices of the villages. Swamiji's revolution didn't need any adjective. His revolution included social, political and economic changes. He laughed at the mind-set of trapping people through words. For Swamiji patriotism was something to be experienced from Russions. Life struggle Lohia told Sapt Kranti and J.P. told Revolution.

According to the philosopher Kubernath Rai the centre of communist parties Achilles heels was—Peasant Problems. Achilles was a famous Greek soldier who was very brave but missed out at instances due to pain in his heels. Heel's pain made his bravery ineffective. Kubernath has considered repetition of Farmer welfare slogan by communist as Aurangzeb.—Murad Brotherhood. Aurangzeb was a follower of Murad but in the end he killed him to take over the thrown. Communist parties were influenced from russions.

Swamiji's broad understanding of Indian ways was pushing him to maintain a distance from communists. Communist party envied swamiji for his affection for farmers and in same lines an urban educated comrade of communist party Indradeep Sinha wrote a book full of abuses for swamiji whose whole lot was burned off by comrade Yogendra Sharma in the interest of party and he slammed Indradeep Sinha for such act. Kubernath used

to call united front of Russia and China a Trojan horse which was only a political attempt to establish communist rule. Rai considered the nationalist forming united front with communists as suicidal. Through Edgar Snow Swamiji got material about the policies of communist party of China. He was trying to impress the Communist Party, Congress Socialist and Radical groups that peasants shall participate in the mass revolution only on being offered equal stature and not under someone else. He was saying so based on his experience from study of Russia and China. Fear of being cheated of equal rights only propelled Swamiji to ask for equal stature for farmers. Swamiji was for broader democratic people's revolution with Kisan main force.

ACCORDING TO KUBERNATH*

Swamiji was not fully devoted to Marxism. Swamiji adopted spirit of Lenin and Mao in the united front. This was not a mere copy of strategy but a strategy which was directed towards state power of the farmer-labour of the country and not the Bolshevik rule. It was based on the Indian circumstances for the farmers. Devotion was for peasant revolution and not Bolshevik. It was for the sake of revolution that swamiji has talked about the Mao's four sectional fronts in which the earners and the producers had a space in the struggle. Communist party was not devoted to the revolution but to the party and were looking for shortcuts through Kerensky or Chwang with whom they can accompany and ditch to grab the rule. This was based more on drawing room politics rather than mass struggle. In Swamiji's point of view Marxism should be broader and should be operational in the transforming fields so that it remains relevant in the form of materialism and

* He was scholar and eminent writer influenced by Jai Prakash in his thinking. He wrote biography of Swamiji and evaluated him honestly.

humanitarian purposes and leaving exceptional circumstances which may lead to acceptance of non-violence. In the point of view of Kubernath:*

Revolution and United Front are important results of a special mood and politics. For politicians it's an introductory book but with a detailed and clear evaluation. Swamiji's attempt to establish the humanitarian values of Marxism through this book is indeed laudable but is unheard in the world of Marxists.

"Keeping this unlimited mature Marxism in mind Swamiji's book *Kranti Aur Sanyukt Morcha* are commendable. Not only Swamiji's but for any scholar from the past, it is not the fact of the statement that should be evaluated but the motive behind the statement which is related to the eternal truth. Facts keep on changing with the time.

Swamiji's mature Vedanta's core was neither understood by the radical Vedantic nor traditional Marxists. Thus in this manner a mature book on Marxism, *Kranti Aur Sanyukt Morcha* was subjected to negligence. Swamiji answered the erstwhile political questions in this book in a very admirable manner. Few important things based on the book are provided below:

1. Establishment of Farmer-labour rule is the revolution.
2. Uprising amongst the public is the aim of revolution.
3. Left wing is the source of the united front revolution.
4. Farmers are the driving force of the revolution.
5. Farmer-labour union is the base of the united front.
6. Cultivable land is the war field.
7. United front is formed between forces of equal stature through defined conditions in one spirit.

* Sapt Kranti and Sampurn Kranti were coined by Lohia and J.P. to distract the attention of working class from forming class organizations and their class struggle. It proved to be only a .

8. In fight against Imperialism, congress is not in a state to be part of united front. This party favours Zamindari which is anti of farmer-Labour rule.
9. Necessary small violent acts cannot be prevented but unnecessary violence is to be prevented. Small violence shall be small indeed.
10. What does Swaraj Means – Whose rule, rule of majority, freedom from exploitation?
11. Salaried person is not the true contributor.

KISHAN SABHA KE SANSMARAN

This book has portrayed the actual circumstances in a beautiful manner. Kubernath Rai has commented:

Swamiji was expert in depicting the actual circumstances through simple language and after reading it whole scene comes in front of the reader. Beauty is that it is not fictional but what has been experienced. Considering this mind automatically bows in front of this sanyasi and this critical mind-set bows to the honesty. After reading this reminiscence the concept is hardened that Swamiji was an active personality in every second of his life.

This brave and enlightened peasant leader has in his reminiscences included the descriptions of several small medium and big protagonists of the struggle. Kubernath recalls the incidence from 15th reminiscence involving boat ride in the dark night in overflowing river full of alligators and while being lost recalling the interesting incidence from Sharatchandra's novel "Srikant". He, himself recalled bravery by a goat to protect her 3 lambs from the attack of dogs which will inspire and project confidence in each reader. If a helpless goat can fight killer dogs to save her lambs and stand in confidence for self-defence then why can't farmers rise up to fight Zamindars to protect their rights.

“Peasant council is a sectional organization. Section means economic section. How can peasant council and farmer sections take the form of sectional organization under a labour party? Communist party might have prepared a replica of Peasant council but real peasant council shall not allow it to happen. Being a multi-sectional organization, interests of Congress can never be in line of Peasant council, why should Kisan Sabha be a follower of communist party then? He asked candidly.

Swamiji believed that establishment of socialism will lead to a society without division where farmers and labours shall not be in conflict with each other. But the question is of current state and in that conflict of interests is quite clear.

Thus Swamiji considered that even after conflict of interest, farmers and labours are friends and both must have different councils and then their united front shall be progressing on the decided and agreed conditions of common class ink rests. This ‘shared composite leadership’ was not acceptable to the Indian Communist party. They wanted control over peasant council. Swamiji was not ready to be a fake leader. Thus peasant council got separated from the communist party in 1945. It refused to be a mass organization of C.P.I.

Now Swamiji was all alone. He already had bad relations with Congress, Congress Socialist and Forward Block. Till his death on 26th June 1950 Swamiji wanted to see a united front of Left Wing Parties. Two meetings were held in Patna and Calcutta and a front was formed but due to non-participation of Congress Socialist and communist parties, it could not sustain and then Swamiji died in few days. This could not be transformed till now. However, he succeeded in establishing United front of 18 left parties in 1948 to 1950. Sheel Bhadra Yajee was its Patna conference in 1948 held at Patna. Sharat Chandra Bose became its first President in 1949 at Calcutta meet. Swamiji became president on 21 Feb 1950 but he died on 26 June 1950.

Swamiji wrote in respect to Revolution and United Front:

Now-a-days people are using word Revolution in such a common manner like children use foul language in the month of 'Phagun'. But people do not understand that merely Revolution is not merely a vision but it is a Programme." It has to be achieved through class struggle.

According to Kubernath Rai, in the erstwhile circumstances a strong programme could have been a united front in the view of Swamiji. During the Ramgarh conference on 19-20 March 1940 same thing was said by Subhash Bose wherein he said that in today's circumstances Revolution means forces against Imperialism. America's revolution in 1776 was also a struggle between foreign capital against the national capital and rule was snatched away from foreign capitalist by national capitalist, leader George Washington. It is called American Revolution. In Swamiji's view fight against Imperialism and victory of farmers-labour is the revolution. Forming union with the left wing was the only way for the united front. "Krantि Aur Sanyukt Morcha" is a simple book on the complex issue. Words have been poured out of heart and touches heart and style is also not conflictive. Description is so clear that even an average educated person can easily understand it and none of the content is left unclear. The entire book is based on action plan of Marxism on sectional front and no other concept other than materialism and confliction has been touched upon. Thus this book is an introductory book of peasant revolution's mentality during the decade of 1940. It has nothing to do with the vision and principles of Marxism. Book says: Mutiny, rule transfer, non-cooperation, violence are not form of revolution. Revolution means change in the basics of all the systems. Subhash Bose and Swamiji had differences on its application and stage of revolution but not on definition. Swami Ji denounced leadership

of proletariat as advocated by C.P.I. and emphasised for combined leadership of Kisan and Mazdoor.

KISHAN KAISE LADTE HAI?

This is a book depicting various incidences wherein the details of peasant struggles are mentioned. It is historical, personal as well as eventual also. The main quotation of the book is inspiring.

Point to be noted is that like Arjun of Geeta here peasant are called for to rise up for the movement. Peasant means one who sows the field. Swamiji believed that one who sows is farmer.

Swamiji's last hope was on playing lead role in the probable revolution of farm labour and peasants in plight. Support of rich peasants shifted to Congress when end of Zamindari was in sight. Shri Krishna Singh from congress party became the CM of Bihar and the support of the section shifted towards congress. Jaiprakash was the centre of attraction for urban class in 1942. Alongwith Jaiprakash, Ramnandan Mishra, Ganga Sharan Singh, Basawan Singh and Suraj Narayan Singh also started shifting towards Socialist party. In mutiny, the work of Dhanraj Sharma, Sheelbhadra, K. N. Shandilya and Shardool Vikram Singh increased and these people got shifted towards Subhash Bose. Kyanand Sharama, Kishori Prassan Singh, Rahul Sanskratayan, Yogendra Sharma, Ganesh Shankar Vidhyarthi, Chandrashekhar Singh etc. joined communist parties. Swamiji was left with Yadunandan Sharma, Ramchandra Sharma and Indulal Yagik in the peasant council. Peasant council lost its old structure of opposing Zamindari. New structure was laid down. Principles were decided, formulas were set but since the new structure was not according to the principles and formula, it could not be implemented. This book is also a collection of braveries of mass struggle. Its purpose was to make

the peasants aware of the shortcomings and also to invoke inspiration through the incidents of bravery of the farmers and also start preparing for a new level of struggle. This book is of historical importance today. This book also tells about the local farmers, incidents of real farmers with the real leaders. Swamiji has beautifully woven real incidents with a fantastic detail descriptions. Its intent is deeply rooted in the ethos of Indian culture fired by passions for freedom. Description of Roop Lal Kumar, Valmiki Koiri, Panchlal, Sitaram Devi and Gasur and Jhabere brother has been done in an exact manner. Bravery of Ram Rup Kumar had been recalled.

Swamiji helped in uprising the women power in Jahanabad in Bihar thereby teaching a lesson to the Zamindars. Swamiji writes:

1. Exploiting forces were not able to treat women as they treated men.
2. It is nature of woman not to recede on taking a step forward once, they then become like a mountain, not to be shaken.
3. If woman gets firm on something then man is forced to take her side.

According to Acharya Kubernath Rai this is the exact picture in Indian context and Swamiji developed this strategy over a period of time. Swamiji writes: Brahmins says that they cannot sow and reap the field but those women got victory on the basis of that activity only breaking the old customs and traditions.

Most of the Zamindars in Central Bihar were also Brahmins and Brahman's Kasthar section was also in dominance there. Swamiji writes:

Zamindars were exploiting farmers. They used to sell the daughters of Brahmins and grab away the half price in form

of their right and remaining half as tax. Small girls were sold to youths and aged so that they pay a hefty price for them. Most of them died when those girls grew up and consequently those girls have to live lives of a widow. Those women used to cry in front of me. They not only took leading role in the battle but also used to slam men for participating with them. This was the first reason of victory.

In Gujrat, Patels are upper caste and wealthier. Real farmers are Rani Parja, Hali and Dubla. Patels used to exploit them as Zamindars used to exploit farmers in Bihar. Swamiji along, with Indulal Yagik united the farmers and taught a lesson to Patels. In this endeavour he got support from Nehru and Subhash.

Swamiji was against talking tall while ignoring the reality. He didn't had slightest of belief in Gandhiji's Trusteeship principle. Due to sectarian attitude caste based party Triveni Sangh lost in 1937 elections and caste based politics was not prevalent in North India before 1974. Triveni Sangh got popularity since 1960 and became a group after 1974 due to Jaiprakash-Lohia's slogan of Ajgar (Aheer, Jaat, Gujar, Rajput) and Triveni. Northern Bihar was partially infected due to this. Farmers remained away from caste and religion based politics for a long time due to the efforts of Swamiji and his class outlook. J.P. and Lohia promoted caste organization and weakened class concept. At present ladu mulayam are product of that very caste politics.

KISHAN KYA KARE?

This is a handbook for farmers. It has tried to infuse confidence, self-respect and willingness to fight amongst the farmers through small stories and incidents by training them for sectional struggle. Different heading gives insight into the themes:

1. Learn to eat-drink
2. Learn Human life
3. Account for and ask for accountability
4. Drop the fear
5. Learn to fight and fight
6. Don't leave it on luck or God.
7. Develop sectional enlightenment.

Swamiji writes:

Thus Zamindari has to be removed. But along with that the current governance system has also to be removed and replaced by a system which is in interest of the farmers. Producers should be given the rule at any cost. Then only suffering can be removed and not through Zamindars or their tactics.

Swamiji has mentioned four characteristics of the Middle Class:

1. Dilemma based mentality
2. Belief in Religion or Superstition
3. Personality Cult
4. Prioritizing oscillation over the struggle

Swamiji talks about Farmer-labour union:

If a family of farmer has 10 members and there are four farm labours then farmer will have to assume his family size of 14 and make arrangements accordingly else he cannot survive. It means peasants and Khet Mazadoors are inseparable class. Theirs class interests are not antagonizing. There is no divide line between poor farmer and khet mazadoor.

Kubernath Rai Comments:

Even the poorest farmer who is unable to accumulate food

for even 6 months and one who has burden of farm labour's family also on his shoulder is also a farmer for Swamiji and that too with equal rights. This is highly disrespectful action on the part of Left Wing of trying to exclude that section of farmer from the peasant council. Right wing, exploits farmers through landowners while left wing try to enforce their principles on the farmers-labours division.

Kubernath gets diverted while struggling with Marxism. Swamiji intends to say that peasant section includes all poor farmers, labours and craftspersons. If they continue to fight among themselves then how can they fight against the Zamindars? This is the reason why Naxalities in Bihar are now and then getting huge funds from abroad. If peasants are united then ruling class shall bow in front of them. Swamiji wanted that peasants works on their ranks and bridge the gap to fight against the officer and wealthier sections. This is where Kubernath Rai cannot envision Swamiji's point. Swamiji is making point of utilizing the surplus labour in increasing industries through taking about their rights and about welfare of peasants in a practical manner. This thought is not a copy or manifestation of communist manifesto. This is where Kubernath Rai missed to understand Swamiji's intentions. Kubernath Rai writes:

It was his love and affection for farmers that dragged him towards Marxism. He didn't joined farmers for Marxism. Neither joined Marxism for farmers. Marxism was the means and farmers interest were the objective. While for trained Marxists this is in reverse form. At maximum he was a Pro-Marxist only and not communist in Marxist sense.

In the erstwhile era many think tanks such as—Subhash, Nehru, Jaiprakash, Narendra Dev and Prem Chand were influenced by Marxism. Swamiji became closer to Marxism due to his

experiences in the class struggle but he was a Vedantic by heart. He was not a person who would believe anything and remain stagnant. This was the reason he had to quit his family, caste, Congress, Gandhi's principles and bookish Marxism alongwith fake Vedanta. He was on the move throughout. Though he faced many obstacles but managed to carve out his way out of those.

This was against the belief of Triveni Sharma Sudhakar and Awadesh Pradhan's belief of Swamiji's philosophy of continued development. His life was full of colours and its each phase whether of a priest in Kashi or as a farmer revolutionary, all phases were bright and large. Sun is red at both hours dusk and dawn. Swamiji remained faithful for the experienced truth and followed it lifelong. This was his wealth and strength.

Swamiji considered caste based councils as a means to divide and in his book Kishan Ko Fasane Ki Tayyariyan he has written about how Zamindars used to use these caste councils to divide different class organizations.

KHET MAZDUR

In this book, Swamiji has explained that the difference between the Farm Labour and Poor Farmer is minimal or negligible, thus any difference between them is not correct. Today's poor farmer shall be tomorrow's farm labour and farm labour, dreams of becoming a small poor farmer. Thus both are friendly sections. Who is a farmer? Swamiji writes:

Lower and poorer are the people in the society closer they are to peasant council. Farm Labour and poor farmers are the two sections we deem to be farmers.

If Swamiji's principle is considered as the thrust then the problem of Naxalism in central Bihar can be resolved. Unification of farmers and labour can reduce violence in the villages. Minimum wage is the right of farm labour. It's the

duty of peasant council to ask the government to pay subsidy for both. Similarly farm labours are paid through goods produced. They have to approach market to sell the produce. Thus farmers and labours needs to fight to get reasonable price for the produce, reducing the cost of production, providing irrigation facilities and infrastructure. Thus union between farmers and labours is the crust and this union can cause government to bow, change or in fact change the government itself. Unionising the farmers and labour shall provide direction to the anticipated peasant movement in the country. Swamiji wrote this book during the peasant revolution while serving in the Hazaribagh Jail and pointed out following: announcing of Kisan Sabha.

Peasant council is not a part of any organisation but instead it is for the people associated with farming and those exploited ones who are earning and dependent on farming for their living. Swami Ji refuses to be mass organization of any party.

During the tenure of Swamiji, many famous leaders from Bihar were in attempt to bifurcate farm labours from the peasant council. However, this attempt to divide farm labour and peasant council got aborted. Swamiji wrote *Khet Mazdur Pushtika* during these times which has following 5 chapters:

1. Farm Labour now and then
2. Labour or Farmer
3. Their Issues
4. Their Solutions
5. How to do it?

Title of the chapters are self-explanatory. Swamiji didn't consider the issue of farm labour as an issue concerned with few communities. He points that the issue is not related to

caste. In the changing circumstances Swamiji kept the interests of farm labour and farmers on the priority and developed plan to equip peasant council with revolutionary characteristics. Though Naxalities developed an acceptance amongst the farm labourers but they lost the spirit by dividing them on the basis of caste. Naxalites used the principles of Swamiji in political terms but got strangled in economic and caste based bifurcation and thereby adopting a path against peasant-labour unity, thereby defeating the spirit of revolution based on farmers-labour union and thus closing the doors for revolution. In this regard Swamiji's vision is clear. His aim is revolution through farmer-labour rule by their union and united front. Swamiji said while inaugurating the 17th session of Bihar Regional Peasant Council in 1950:

We need to adopt the most exploited, in suffering state people from the village. This is their age. We shall conquer only when they shall be together. Remember, dream of a farmer-labour state cannot be true without them. Naxals did not care for this unity and consequently failed.

Time has proved that his thought was correct. Due to his untimely death and division of peasant council Swamiji failed to give a new shape to the peasant council. And was desirous for it till his death. After Swamiji's death, his disciple Kharagdhari Mishra alias Tumdiya Baba formed different peasant organizations in 1968 from 27 to 29 December. Tumdiya Baba was nephew of Yadunandan Sharma.

In *Khet Mazdur*, the root of the farming problems in India has been elaborated. It has objective and principle based evaluation of the state of farm labours. Swamiji saw the complex issue of farm labour from the point of view of revolution and gave the solution, but none of the peasant council succeeded to fulfil his desires. In the viewpoint of tribal leaders, problem

of farmers of Jharkhand was a separate issue, communists took it as a regional and sub-national issue. Naxalites thought caste based struggle as the solution. Farmer revolution remained limited to the price of produce, electricity, water and other means. None of the organization was dedicated to unite the farmers and labour to change the basics of governance. Swamiji's desires remained unfulfilled. He didn't had any heir C.P.I. M.L. General Secretary Vinod Mishra understood the importance of Swamiji but he died untimely. Slowly and slowly his arty was moving from Mao to Sahajanand.

JHARKHAND KE KISHAAN

From 19th April 1940 to 8th March 1942, Swamiji was in Hazaribagh central jail where he wrote this book.

Main attraction of this book is that in this book the tribal has been potrayed as the farmers of Jharkhand. This is correct also. Tribals are in majority and their means of living is farming. They are about one-third in the whole population of Jharkhand. Thus from production point of view this is not a different caste, creed, region or sub, nationality based issue. Most of the people are earn through jobs associated with farming and Tribals are also a part of the main farmer section. Second attraction of the book is that it has detailed description of different farming techniques of the tribal region. Also many forms of tribal exploitation have also been explained. Tribal of Jharkhand were troubled by non-tribal, Zamindars, officers class, capitalists, Missionary, Mahajani, Imperialist and labour leaders. People from missionary prevented exploitation but forced to adopt foreign goods and culture thereby eroding the local tribal culture of the region. Labour leaders used to protect the interest of the wealthier producers. Explaining about different forms of exploitation this book is indeed an eye opener. Even Tribal leaders were furious to get resources and service. This book

also talks about the historical events of Jharkhand. This book is an ocean in itself and is a unique creation on the prevailing situations of decade of 1940.

Swamiji said in the 13th session of Bihar Regional Peasant Council in Bermo on 29-30 June 1946:

This is the first instance when you have tried to organize a meeting. This is a big deal for Jharkhand which has always been exploited and poor. That's why we bow before you all.

If the farmers of Jharkhand become aware, their self-respect will be provoked on their own and they will better know their duties and no one shall be able to exploit them. Then Marwari, Money Lenders, Lawyers, Missionaries, Religious leaders, Zamindars and government shall not be able to exploit them. Jharkhand has a lot of potential in the form of coal and iron.

On this instance, Triveni Sharma also agrees with Swamiji. He writes:

Swamiji called up the farmers of Jharkhand by mentioning the names of Tilka, Bermo is in Jharkhand. Manjhi, Sidhu and Birsa. Actually, if mode of production is accepted as criteria, basically, Tribals are farmers with their own speciality.

Question of restoring and re-building the respect and happiness of the farmers of Jharkhand is still pending. By linking this question to the Peasant problems, the process of caste based fights, Naxalism, and dependency on the labour leaders of the colliery is still continuing. There are no true efforts for improving the state of Jharkhand's farmers based on correct evaluation of the prevailing situations. These are many question which are still looking for solutions. Foreigners are looting people through missionaries, officers and leaders. Even labour leaders

were in practice of exploiting the tribals Swamiji pointed out.

KISHANO KE DAAVE AUR KARYAKRAM KA KHAREETA

This important book could not be evaluated by Kubermath Rai. It has 3 important points:

1. Swamiji has not used the word demand for farmers. He has provided the list of farmer's claims and programmes. Rights of farmers has been called claims and not demands. This is a proof of strength of the peasant uprising and its style.
2. Swamiji said that there shall be two fronts of struggle: one Legal and other Illegal. Through legal struggle few demands of farmers can be met with the help of parliament but not many. Secondly, parliamentary way is not enough to enlighten farmers. Main means shall be non-parliamentary, non-parliamentary means class struggle. He distanced himself both from C.P.I. and Naxals view point. Swami Ji advocated for mass uprising.
3. Farming should be profitable. Surplus population should be used in industries. Swamiji was against murder of class enemy. He was advocating class struggle.

Swamiji didn't consider 15th August 1947 as the day of complete independence. Even after that India's relation with foreign money was continuing. Their policies were influenced by foreigners. Constitutional council was not formed by formal elections but by limited voting rights of Lords, Sir, and Rai Bahadur etc. and not by elected representatives of farmer-labour class. Swamiji considered constitution insufficient for the

* Naxals advocate for protracted long war through armed forces and area wise seizure. C.P.I. indulges in parliamentary affairs. Swami Ji line discards both extremity and emphasizes on militant class struggle.

welfare of public and considered non-parliamentary way as the main means. He also clears about the non-parliamentary means. It does not mean mutiny, violence and terrorism but means class struggle. Through this means farmers and labours can achieve their objectives by giving a fierce form to their struggle. This small book is of great importance for showing path for future revolution.

Swamiji has written in this book:

1. Parliamentary ways of struggle are and of second order.
2. There is another legal programme and way which can help farmers to develop against the selfishness and reaction but can be achieved only by training and when driven by reliable vision of revolutionary tested and tried leaders.
3. The last thing takes place only when the struggle outside takes place with the struggle inside the parliament.
4. Second way in which people can achieve solution for their problems is non-parliamentary, involving frontal actions and these illegal activities for farmers are only sectional class struggles of exploited and oppressed.
5. Political freedom is only a means to achieve and the aim is to stop exploitation of humans by humans in the society and thus in manner aiming for overall development of all individuals and using all the available resources for development.
6. Capitalism is a means cleverly developed by exploiters which results in accumulation of wealth in the hands of wealthier people only. Equal voting rights should be provided. Swamiji has raised 46 issues in *Kishano Ke Daave Aur Karyakram Ka Khareeta*. It includes Panchayat farming, economic holding for 10-25 acres, abolishing of Zamindari, land distribution, establishment of

industries, license to be armed etc. are the claims included.

7. Swamiji's economic thinking was in favour of society and has many new dimensions. According to Professor G. S. Bhasan was that of a messiah. This vision was developed as a result of 61 years of life and 35 years of social life which included good and bad situations. Farmers are the right owners of the development, based on hard work which is the source of all the development. All the luxuries, infrastructure, comforts and resources are based on it. But development plan was not prepared according to the need of farmers. People controlling production development structure and increasing problem of resources in states gave farm problems a larger shape. Swamiji has written about it in his book: Exploitative Agrarian Condition of Country side must change.
1. System of arranging land, paying labour and loan which was made cruel by British and which was based on policy of indirectly exploiting farmers, should be ended to improve the situation of farmers.

Swamiji's this experience was based on the self-experience actions of governments during 1939, 1946 and 1947. During Baijwada sessions, Swamiji expressed this anger in his speeches. Swamiji considered formation of constitution council without proper voting rights to general public, against farmers and labours.

Swamiji writes about his experiences in peasant councils:

Peasant council shall call out to people to challenge the framed Indian Constitution as incorrect and will call for Legislative council of people which shall be elected on the

basis of common voting rights and farmers and labour shall get equal stature in running the government. The present constitution has been framed by elite classes.

Swami Ji Challenged the very making of constitution and formation of Substituent Assembly in 1946.

MAHARUDRA KA MAHATANDAV

Swamiji ended his relations with congress forever by resigning on 6th December 1948. Aftermath he was involved in efforts to bring peasant council and left wing on one platform on the basis of principles and new formulas. In this respect he lacked support from two big parties, congress socialist and communist party. One section of communist party under Somnath Lahiri was in support of swamiji but Randive section was on policy of 'Ekla Chalo', walk alone. Swamiji got his speech published in newspapers while resigning from congress. He wrote:

The purpose for which congress was born has been achieved on 15th August 1947. Since Nagpur session of December 1920 to till date I never quit from congress and served it as per my ability. In between few people like me were expelled from congress along with Subhash Bose but it was our compulsion that we didn't wanted to quit from Congress. In country's fight for freedom we considered this, disloyalty towards the country, even though that policy was related to our differences with the high command."

In 1939, Subhash Bose and Swamiji were expelled from congress on the grounds of indiscipline. That disgusting situation was unbearable for both of them and they raised their hand against British and their stooges by organizing a session against compromise policies in Ramgarh on 19-20 March 1940. Soon Swamiji was arrested on 19th April and Subhash was placed under house arrest. Swamiji gave a new manta to the parties by

writing new book *Ab Kya Ho?* after independence.

In the same course another book *Maharudra Ka Mahatandav* was written. It has collection of Swamiji's philosophy. It is sharp and aggressive. This book is about Revolution of down from deem class.

It has following things:

1. It has sectional class based definition of history of Indian Independence. Fight of 1857 was fought by ruling class. With the birth of congress in 1885 the responsibility came in the hands of capitalists. Till 1916 it was in hands of liberals. From 1916-1919 it was in hands of followers of Tilak. Then it came in the hands of Gandhiji who was with both liberals and Tilkaites. In 1934 under the influence of socialism, Gandhiji lost hold over congress. With participation of public in affairs of congress it no longer remained to the elites cadre. Participation of farmers and labour made congress widespread. It became a party of sacrifice but by the dawn of 1947 lavishers were again in control. Second World War and violence of 1942 by the Psu do left wing again established elites in the main stream of politics and Gandhiji again became the leader. In the name of freedom, key of colonized Swaraj was handed over to this class. Farmers were left behind. Desire of complete freedom came up as outcome of blow.
2. This book depicts the romance of elite cadre during the August revolution of 1942 and has been termed as demoralizing for the farmers and labours. Due to 1942 sectional unity of working class was broken down and elite class got an opportunity to grab the power through adventurism and compromise. Participating Public were be fooled. Leadership surrendered to Empire and

compromised by accepting dominion status for zamindar-Maldar state power.

3. Discourse of true religion is a blow to fundamentalism.
4. Defining who is farmer?

“Person in penury or farm labour who has nothing or a small farmer who somehow manages to earn from his land, these are the only two groups who can be termed as farmers and for serving whom we are eager. The lower they are in the society, closer they are to the peasant council. Thus who is at the bottommost of the society is closest to us. After that comes small farmer. Here ends the actual peasant classification”.

5. *Maharudra Ka Mahatandav* is the symbolic word of peasant uprising. Swamiji says:

This revolution or Peasant council are the symbol of those ample revolutionary social forces which leads to upheaval. Birth of socialist party, Forward Block and various left wing has been to show the correct path from time to time and leaders of these parties have been dedicated congressmen or members of peasant council who were and are still leaders.

Leaders of Congress socialists betrayed and switchehd our to congress. This definition has force alongwith balance. Rahul Sanskratayan, Jharkhande Rai, Kishori Prassann Singh, Karyanand Sharma and Numbudripad were socialist before the birth of communist and were operational in peasant council. Benipuri, Yogendra Shukla, Ramnandan Mishra, Jaiprakash, Basawan, Surajnarayan Singh, Ganga Sharan Singh and Ramayan Rai used to call themselves socialist till the end, but became idle after 1941 and abandoned the path of class struggle and kisan movement.

6. Language of this book is simple and heart touching.
7. Importance to farmers was not acceptable to the communist party. Swamiji's farmer had equal rights but communist supported peasant council only to an extent and whose usefulness was short lived. This people driven revolution was helpful in the actual revolution. Farmers were unimportant in the socialist revolution but Swamiji considered farmers as equal contributor in the revolution and was champion of keeping peasant council away from control of any party. He had differences with all on this point. No one was ready to accept farmers as an independent section. For them they were only a collection and dependent entity, a platform to implement party's policies. Swamiji was against this and disliked to join any party and used to carve away from them.
8. Biography started from *Mera Jeevan Sangharsh* was concluded in *Maharudra Ka Mahatandav*. Without reading it, complete personality of Swamiji cannot be understood. Biggest importance of these books is the unique evaluation done which has narrations of India's Independence Struggle, August Revolution and definition of Farmers, changing forms of congress, religion and god. Here Shiv represents the farmers.

In Indian Mythology, Shiva has been considered as supreme and unique. His posture of *Natraj* has many meanings, when he do *Tandav*, whole earth gets shaken with his footstep. He collects sky in his semi-circular arms. With blows of his shoulders, stars and moon are broken down and heaven is quaked. Origin of Shiva are unknown and whose clothing is the sky and whose laughter provides eternal happiness. Shiva consumes everything to create a new universe. Poet Dinkar has written a poem on this in his collection '*Hunkar*'. This depicts

Swamiji's fierce state which can bring life even to the dead ones. Tandav is used for revolution and Maha Rudra for poor peasants and be bonrs.

Swamiji on strength of his karma and hard work created a storm in Indian politics in 1936-40 and as a result foreign educated elitas were eclipsed, elite class leaders were delimitated and brought under check. But at last conspirators won after exit of Subhash in 1941.

KRANTI AUR SANYUKT MORCHA

This book was completed on 14th August 1947. At that time Swamiji was a prisoner in Hazaribagh Central Jail. Subhash was operational against the British since 19-20 March 1940 (when whole congress was praising British for their kind heartedness and long term vision). Chapters of this book are as follow:

1. Kranti Aur Uski Kisme (Revolution and its types)
2. Poounjiwadi Kranti Aur Sarvhara Kranti (Bourgeoisie Revolution and proletariat Revolution)
3. Sarvhara ka netritya (Leadership of Proletariat)
4. Varg Sangharsh Aur Sarkar (Class struggle and govt.)
5. Kishan Aur Kranti (Peasant and Revolution)
6. Sarvhara Ka Ektantra aur Gantantra (Dictatorship of Proletariat)
7. Sanyukt Morcha (United Front)

According to Swamiji revolution can be defined in following manner: He was surely in flounced by Lenin and Bdgar snow.

State Revolution is the real revolution. Bringing about changes in the basics, abrupt changes, and turmoil in the governance pattern, fundamental change in the ruling system and changing the basics of the government is called revolution.

The definition of united front was never understood by Swamiji that different political units in national congress together form the united front. This was unseen that one particular group keeps on burdening its habits and we continue to call it united front. M. N. Rai, Jaiprakash, Lohiya, P. C. Joshi were of opinion that congress is the United Front. This book was against their thoughts. Swamiji wanted to establish Left Wing, supported Farmer, labour united front which shall defeat British, Zamidars and Maladars and establish a rule of farmers and labours.

According to him farmers are the main force in any revolution. Struggle against imperialist and their friends is the true struggle, having farmer-labour led combined leadership and it is the goal of revolution. In the view of communist parties congress is itself a united front and Trade unions were main force of revolution. Limits of Lohia, Jaiprakash and Narendra Dev were within the boundaries defined by Gandhiji. Swamiji had huge differences with left wing on these issues. Communist did not believe in public language or culture. They were supporting Pakistan. Swamiji was annoyed and this book was result of it. Swamiji saw success of Lenin's February Revolution and China's uprising as a result of support from farmers and was trying to impart these learnings to the Indian Left Wing activists, which they ignored. Book was neglected through conspiracy and was lost from the memory. Swamiji placed greater importance to daily wage earner over the salaried class and called them to participate with farmers in the revolution with equal status so that imperialism, Zamindari and capitalism can be thrown out at once. Under combined leadership of Peasant council and labour council with equal rights state revolution could have been made a success but communist party wanted Kisan Sabha as a follower mass front and dependent unit. This was unacceptable to Swamiji. Swamiji believed the theory of dictatorship of proletariat in 1941 when he was writing *Kranti*

Aru Sanyukta Morcha but in 1947 he was writing introduction to "Kisan Sabha Ka Sansmaran" he denounced it and replace it by combined leadership of Kisan and Mazdoor instead of single proletariat. Swamiji emphasis was on mass organizations instead of dictatorship. Now, he was for broader peoples democracy. Swamiji was torch bearer and path finder of freedom struggle of India and Liberation struggle of Mazadoor and Kisan class. He was mentor to the protagonists. Gandhiaites and congress socialists were involved in gimmicks. Gandhi was their real packaging master and Jai Prakash was slogan raiser and adventurist. He abandoned the path of class struggle and instead he involved himself in class collaboration since 1940. Myron in his book depicts jay prakash and his congress socialist party as second line of defence of Indian Bourgeoisie induce course his observation proued to be correct he adopted Gandhism abandoning his well advertised Marxism. Latteron, he aligned with Bhartiya Janata Party and Jamait Islami to get central of Government. He nominated Morarji as Prme Minister in 1977, in the same way as Gandhi nominated Nehru in 1946-47 by abandoning democracy. He and Lohia also switched to case political alignment losing class conception. Jay Prakash tried to be have like extra constitutional authority but Morarji did not oblige. A section of C.P.I. remained in Nehru Bhakti. This not acceptable to another section. Party under student division in 1964. Congress socialists devoid of any revolutionary perspective and world vision were fragmented in several parts. But, ultimately Lohia and J.P. got success in establishing two main party of Indian bourgeoisie on same principle for Indian capitalists benefit, congress and B.J.P.

DIFFERENCES WITH POLITICAL PARTIES

Swamiji had differences with Congress and other political parties on following grounds:

Point of differences with Congress:

- 1. Sectional stand:** Congress was dominated by Zamindars, while peasant council was full of farmers. Farmers and Zamindars are against each other diametrically opposite to each other.
- 2. Stand on Imperialism:** Congress wanted to compromise with imperialist rather than fighting against them while peasant council wanted demolition of Zamindars section which was protected by imperialists. Congress didn't wanted to ruin their relations with imperialists, while peasant council was against full co-operation.
- 3. Goal of Independence:** Congress was satisfied with colonized independence while peasant council wanted complete independence. Swamiji considered freedom of 15th August 1947 as death of complete Independence. Foreign money was still in dominance in the country. Mountbatten remained the Governor General even after independence. English influence was allowed to sustain in the name of Commonwealth. Kisan Sabha was against dominion status.
- 4. Behaviour Towards Peasant Council:** After 1937 Congress started opposing Peasant Council and Peasant

revolution and became harsh on farmers.

5. **Behaviour Towards Subhash:** Leaders from Farmer – Labour union like Swamiji and Subhash were expelled from congress in the name of indiscipline. Congress continued to negotiate in form of Irwin Agreement, Crips Agreement, Cabinet Mission Agreement, Vavel Agreement and Mountbatten Agreement. Swamiji disliked this compromising attitude.
6. **Question of Starting Independence Struggle:** Peasant council wanted announcement of revolution as soon as possible. Other than Swamiji, Subhash was also its strong propagator. Both of them started revolution by conducting session in Ramgarh against the negotiating policies in 19-20 march 1940 but congress leaders were inclined towards negotiations. On 9th August 1942 slogan of 'British Quit India' 'was coined and congressmen were jailed. Swamiji was arrested on 20th March 1940 and Swamiji was soon under jail arrest but congressmen remained quiet till 1942.
7. **Abolition of Zamindari:** Gandhiji wanted to save Zamindari under garb of trusteeship. Peasant council considering trusteeship principle a treachery.
8. **Policy of Organizing People:** Congress didn't consider peasant council more than a sectional wing which could propagate its policies in rural areas. After 1937 peasant council and farmers both became fierce. They were not ready for anything less than abolition of Zamindari and imperialism and were not ready to accept policies of congress supporting Zamindars. It remained an independent council of farmers and continued to operate in parallel.
9. **Religious Policies:** Peasant council was against Gandhiji's religious policies. As per Swamiji, religion

was an individual's choice and not a thing of display or politics. Peasant council wanted politics on pure economical basis and not on religious grounds.

10. Congress Working Committee passed the proposal for division but A.I.C.C. dropped it after resistance from Swamiji, Purshottam Das Tandon and Gaffar Khan etc. Gandhiji re-raised the proposal and made kind appeals in favour of division. Congress Socialists supported Gandhiji and proposal was passed with 29 against 15. Swamiji was strictly against division of the country. Communists supported it and socialists were confused and followed Gandhi.
11. Congress didn't took help of farmers in framing constitution. Members of constitution committee were not chosen from valid voting rights, instead a constituent assembly selected through limited voting rights was transformed into constitution committee. There were no representatives from the public. Constitution is silent on Employment Guarantee and thus middlemen are happy. Swamiji was against this process.
12. Zamindars wore Khadi to become leaders in congress and were strict opposers of farmers. Sir C. P. N. Kamakhya Narayan, Raja Radhika Raman, Lord Sacchidanand were such leaders.

Differences between Peasant Council and Congress Socialist Party:

1. Congress Socialist was B team of Congress till the end.
2. It continues to work within the parameters of Gandhiji. It considered Gandhian Philosophy insufficient but in the end went on to support Gandhiji.
3. Their leaders lacked confidence.
4. It lacked revolutionary background and harijan.

5. Leadership was urban, existing between farmers for long was not possible for them. Congress Socialist Party was second line of defence of Indian Bourgeoisie. It was appendix of Gandhi-Nehru leadership.
6. They were inclined towards personal, surprising and romantic incidents.
7. It was hard for them to exist in class struggle.
8. They were more interested in debates and academic works, were away from mass struggle, and were in favour of automatic actions.
9. Policies were ambiguous and double.
10. There was no dialogue between leaders and workers.
11. Overloaded with leaders.
12. Party members had connections with Birla, Bajaj, Goenka and Rana. They were less dependent on public for Press, material and funds which were collected from capitalists.
13. Saved themselves from British by opposing Subhash and lived a comfortable life in Lahore Jail in 1943.
14. The leaders of this party fought election on their own in the pride of popularity and lost, lost self confidence also.
15. Leaders were over ambitious and lacked team spirit and central philosophy.
16. Leader availed many facilities. Capitalists were using them to weaken rulers and Zamindars so that Imperialists could increase their hold without opposition and after abolition of Zamindari they could grab the properties of rulers through share markets and increase their business.
17. They were hungry for popularity and wanted media coverage. So, they used to indulge in adventurism.
18. They were away from peasant council, student council

and labour council. Party got dissolved without the support from the society as it was latter on formed on basis of caste.

19. Opposition with peasant council was because socialist leaders were from urban, elite class and wealthier background. Leaders were from wealthy families and foreign educated. Leaders of Peasant council were mostly from poor background. Class interests and principles were main cause of differences. Narendra Dev was influenced by Herbet Miller. He was also influenced by Dr. Brown and Dr. Venice. Lohia was influenced by Roja, Hitler and Gandhi.

Differences between Communists and Peasant Council

1. Communist motive to make peasant council its wing as mass organization.
2. Urban class was in dominance in communist party while peasant council was led by rural farmers.
3. Communist Support for demand for Pakistan.
4. Lack of national vision in Communist party.
5. Supporting National front over Left front.
6. Wrong policy of communist to accept Gandhiji as the leader instead of Subhash Bose.
7. Communist policy of considering different wings of Congress as the united front constituent.
8. Refusing to allow Left front to form a new party.
9. Dominance of British customs and lack of local social culture.
10. Importance to internationalism over nationalism.
11. Effect of foreign directives on party Till 1951, it had no action plan of its own.
12. Inability to decide the policies as per the prevailing conditions in the country.

13. Working against religions instead of fighting their exploitation.
14. Their policy of more production was wrong during Second World war to support British Army.
15. Accusing Swamiji of personalization by the party.
16. Accusing Swamiji of favouring peasants and fighting with the C.P.I. party for their equal role and status in impending revolution at par with organized labour.
17. Declining the proposal of collective leadership by C.P.I.
18. Wrong policies of considering peasant council as a wing.
19. Party did not supported policy of Swamiji in 1943-45 to spread Peasant council. Communist Party was devoid of any action plan up to 1951. It was merely following directions from England and Soviet communists.
20. Party declined to find self-criticism internally. While Swamiji was of this nature. Poor farmers were his base. Leadership of communist was under think tanks who got inspiration from foreigners.
21. Wrong estimation of changing forms of imperialism and capitalism by the party. Thus inability to properly understand the Indian Society and characterise it.
22. Party didn't considered farmers as the main force of revolution while peasant council considered it the same and considered it of equal importance and rights in future revolution.
23. Swamiji oppsed establishing Pakistan but C.P.I. supported it.
24. C.P.I. leadership was elitistic who were against mass culture, mass uprising most of them were Nehruvians.

Differences between Forward Block and Peasant Council

1. Subhash and Swamiji were in agreement on the definition of Revolution but had differences on

stage, priority and emphasis. Focus of Swamiji was on Sectional class struggle while that of Subhash was focused against imperialism and rebellion.

2. Swamiji considered Subhash as the leader of left wing and wanted that he should stay in country to provide leadership and direction to the fight, both against right wings and Imperialism. Subhash wanted to see the country free as soon as possible. Thus he left for Japan which Swamiji disliked. Subhash priority was fight against imperialism in first stage. Swami Ji wants fight against all oppressors in one stroke.
3. In Swamiji's point of view Subhash failed to identify the imperialist face of Japan. He ignored the violence by Japan in China, Shanghai and Nanking.
4. Subhash considered Swamiji as the biggest leader of Left Wing in the country and wanted that the struggle should be initiated under his guidance. In the absence of proper guidance, Indian left Wing were being pushed to blindly follow European methods. This hollowness was being filled through, casteism, violence and communalism. There was a lot of violence due to casteism and peace was disturbed due to fanaticism, violence, indiscipline and regionalism. In such situation Swamiji could have been the solution. Swamiji was in favour of making a united front of poor people. He was in favour of resolving various differences between the poor classes also. He wanted to see the rule in their hands. He wanted that rule of those sitting idle and not involved in production should end. Priority of Swamiji was fight against feudalism, capitalism, imperialism together for democratic revolution whereas Subhash was in favour of socialist revolution.

It is the need of the hour to understand the humanity and public oriented principles of Swamiji and continue his legacy. His philosophy of Farmer-labour rule was in favour of the country.

Swamiji has written in his biography *Mera Jeevan Sangharsh*:

I am in favour of handing the rule in the hands of earners by snatching it from the ruling class. I am not in favour of dropping economic struggle in favour of freedom struggle. I wanted to convert economic struggle into freedom struggle. I want social, economic and political revolution and this cannot happen in any other way. I will favour such people but due to presence of people who often switch their loyalty I fear joining any political outfit, I will thus not join any political party. For this we need to prepare a group of strong leaders and workers. But those who are not a part of economic programmes for farmers and labours and are not working towards uniting them towards the struggle they cannot be our leader or activists. I don't want bookish knowledge. Only bookish knowledge leads to unfaithfulness. I want a struggle and strugglers. Congress socialists were more bookish and academic.

Swamiji says: We will have to fight to gain the rule. Then only we shall be able to sustain it. If it is received with ease, it shall be again snatched away. Anything received easily is not a gain in my view. He wanted continuity and militancy in struggle. But C.S.P. was working at the tune of Nehru and C.P.I. was guided by communists of England.

We have seen the result of Russian victory over Afghanistan and American over Vietnam. Both super power fell apart. Swamiji had firm belief in struggle through working class. Swamiji used to quote Marx, Angles and Lenin and Stalin for the historical references but he was a nationalist, humanitarian and people welfare-oriented. While Narendra Dev believed in

social analysis and development's process from Marx and Angel's point of view, Swamiji's belief was based on his own culture and history. He didn't believe in Historical Socialism. Swamiji never accepted that Kalidas and Baan Bhatt were from grazer's society. Swamiji believed that a human was a result of changing circumstances and also that a human can change the circumstances. Revolutionary efforts and personal qualities are equally important as revolutionary conditions. Comrades used to accuse Swamiji of being personalised due to these thoughts but Swamiji was not in favour of snatching the freedom of individual totally. He had differences with Marxism on these points. He believed that taking the rule from one class to other class forcefully is revolution but it should not involve much violence and blood shedding. He believed in uprising and for this, self-defence was sufficient. Swamiji's Marxism was not a follower of Russian way. Instead of socialism he called out for public rule, rule of farmers and labour. He was not in favour of party dictatorship.

Swamiji didn't want to tie farmers to any knot. He welcomed Zamindari opposing struggle of Congress, Socialists, Radicals, Forward Block, Gadar Party but was not a follower of any particular Party. In the words of Bhagwati Sharan.

Story of Indian peasant revolution is quiet complicated, thus becoming long while it should have been shorter.

In between this Swamiji saw the commitment in Subhash which with its firmness, efficiency and bravery could make a place amongst the public and respectfully replace the British and Gandhian philosophy among the youths and this is what was evaluated in the Ramgarh session on 19-20 March 1940, which was headed by Subhash Bose and welcoming committee was headed by Swamiji. This is the point from where Quit India Movement started in which British had to face militant Indian.

Slogans were raised:

“Evict the Britishers”

“Death or Freedom”

“Na Ek Pai Aur Na Ek Bhai”

In WW – II supply of both men and food were stopped to British. No Revenue, No soldier. Swamiji was jailed for 3 years and Subhash was placed under house arrest.

Under Swamiji's leadership following peasant struggles took place in Bihar:

1. Badahiya Struggle—1936-1999, regional leadership Karyanand Sharma
2. Rewra Struggle—1938, Yadunandan Sharma
3. Manjhiyava Struggle—Shivdutt Sharma, Yadunandan Sharma
4. Dhanua, Magda, Bhalua, Majhave, Sambe, Sanda Struggle—1936-39, Yadunandan Sharma
5. Badgao Parigao 1936-39 (Ramsuhag Pande), Sato Seemri
6. Amwari Parsadi and Chitali Struggle—Rahul Sanskratayan (Saran Dist Seewan) 1936-39
7. Radhopur, Devkuli Pandaul, Padri Struggle : 1936-39 (Darbhanga) Ramanand Mishra* leader
8. Dharampura, Ankuri, Jalpura, Talpura—Beldarichak leader Yadunandan Sharma.
9. Bihta Struggle : North Munger, 1946-49
10. Bihta Struggle, Darbhanga, 1946-49
11. Pathra Struggle, Munger, 1946-49
12. Madhepur Struggle, Darbhanga, 1946-49
13. Machuri Struggle, Bihar Shareef, 1946-49
14. Sasaram Struggle, 1946-49

* Ramanand Mishra was scholar Marxist. He traversed from class struggle to class collaboration, from Marx to Gandhi and Sarvodaya.

15. Darigav Struggle, Ara, 1946-49
16. Alawalpur Struggle, Patna, 1946-49
17. Naviganj Struggle, Gaya, 1946-49
18. Kursela Struggle, Poornia, 1946-49
19. Dumurao (Ara) Struggle, 1942

Millions of farmers participated in these struggles. Swamiji commented: 26 November 1936 Seewan farmer Rally: "All struggles of congress have been fought by public, while Zamindars and capitalist continued to favour imperialist. When Zamindars and capitalists realised that it is useless to expect more benefits from imperialist now, then they started to enter congress to influence its main thinking." In Swamiji opinion, Zamindars, capitalists and elite classes were main stem of imperialism. Congress was financed by mill owners and was dominated by Zamindars and led by elites. All were parasites. Kisan and Mazdoor class are the real and main force who produces wealth and it was they who sustain the society. They are "who produces snag" on which whole structure of society rests. If "shesnag" moves the whole structure of exploitation will crumble. So, priority is to awaken the Kisan and labour class through struggle for economic rights, ultimately leading to state revolution, over throw of exploited class. Subhas agreed with him but his liking and emphasis was not on class struggle but on overthrow of imperialism by any means and without delay. He wanted socialism in second stage of revolution. Swamiji wanted end of imperialism, capitalism and feudalism in one throw and instead establishing Kisan-Mazadoor state powers through broader militant democratic revolution. Both had zeal, honesty and respect for each other. But, structure of congress socialist party and communist party of India was such urbanite , elitistic, undemocratic, oscillating that they could not utilize such Dhakar Personalities as Subhash, Swamiji,

Yagik, Bapat, Shardul Vikram, Kamath, Yajee and others who were all nearer to Marx. It was ridiculous that C.S.P. and C.P.I. both preferred pre-capitalistic and feudal Gandhi as their torch bearer. This miscalculation of C.P.I. proved ultimately defeat of left politics in India. Congress socialist leaders were followers of Nehru and second line of defense of Indian Bourgeoisie. They always in hours of need switched and tilted towards Gandhi and Nehru. Nehru was their role model and mentor. Their class origin and class interest were same J.P. and Lohia were fought in America and Germany respectively. They disliked class struggle from core of their heart. When suitable opportunity came in 1939, they betrayed the cause, Subhas and Sahajanand and about turned towards Gandhi and his ism. During 1929 to 1938 Jai Prakash was a comp follower of Sahajanand. Sahajanand had made him president of Gaya district congress although he belonged to Saran district. He made him member of A.I.C.W. Sahajanand kept him in central Kisan council made him president of Bihars provincial Kissan session. He made him charge of Kisan Movement under over all supervision of Yadunandan Sharma. J.P. and Narendra were teachers in worker training camp organized at Sonepur. J.P. was writer of why socialism ? All were for go hen and C.S.P. a jounned class struggle after 1939 and accepted Ganshism instead.

It was miserable and to be lamented.

BACKGROUND OF RAMGARH CONGRESS

There was a huge clash between Subhash Bose and Gandhiji on the principles and personality, as Congress Chief Subhash defeated Gandhiji's candidate Pattabhi Sitaramaiya by 1580 votes against 1377 at Tripuri. This difference was more than 200. It was clear that nation has approved Subhash's People-oriented and imperialist opposing policies. Many famous leaders were on Gandhiji's side. Netaji had Swamiji, Shardool Vikram Singh, Nariman and Hari Vishnu Kamath on his side. All followers of Gandhiji were mature, well-educated and expert in Strategies, intrigues gimmicks and movale vering. They were also heading some or other states. On this Subhash's elder brother Sharat Chandra Bose told Vibha:

Chances of Subhash being elected are least. He has been surrounded from all sides. (Mahanayak: Vishwas Patil)

But all barriers were demolished in front of Subhash's dedication, confidence, patriotism and sacrificing personality and Subhash pulled control of Congress from hands of Gandhiji. Jawaharlal Nehru showed cautions in Subhash-Gandhi dispute. He left for Kumaon for vacations and returned to Shantiniketen next day after results were announced. Here, he met Subhash. He said:

Subhash, I praise your bravery. It never happened nor shall happen in the history of the party. (Mahanayak: Vishwas Patil)

Gandhiji expressed his furiousness in following way:

Subhash has achieved decisive win against Pattabhi. I was against his election from the beginning. It was the only reason why Pattabhi did took the candidature and thus I think this is my defeat.

When Subhash met Gandhiji, then he asked him simply—Mahatma, who all should be included in the new working committee. Please guide us.

Gandhiji asked: What do you think? Subhash Bose said:

Swami Sahajanand Saraswati, Jaiprakash, Narendra Dev, Manvendra Nath Rai*, Nariman** and other than these, Jawaharlal, Sardar Patel and Azad shall be there of course. Subhash wanted composite working committee.

Most of these names were of socialists and members sympathizers of the peasant council. Gandhiji said:

'I don't think Sardar Patel and his friends shall be able to help you in Tripuri'. Gandhi did not like Sahajanand and Nariman. He wanted only rightists in the committee.

Subhash said:

"This dispute has only one solution, your leadership. Then all things shall be simple".

Subhash, while suffering from 103 degree fever received resignation of 12 members of old working committee.

"At this moment we feel that it is correct to resign from the committee." They said Nehru was on double trade.

Resignation letters had signatures of 12 members of working committee including Patel and Rajendra Prasad. Jawaharlal sent

* M.N. Rai was an ideologue and founder of C.P.I. and radical party.

** Nariman was famous Barister of Bombay supporter of Subhash.

a separate message instead of signing. Remaining two members were Subhash and Sharat Chandra Bose*. C.M. of M.P. Bhav Khare informed Sharat Bose about this on time.

Pt. Govind Vallabh Pant presented a proposal which had sign of 160 members of All India Congress Committee which state that:

Placing our faith in the dexterous leadership of Gandhiji, I request the head to accept the proposal for selection of members as per desire of Gandhiji.

Nariman understood this tactic. Babu Ji Aade, Swamiji and M. N. Rai etc. warned Subhash. Kaka Gadgil was deeply sadden. He considered Subhash as an upright man. Subhash was suffering from Pneumonia. Group under Gandhiji's leadership was not for compromise at any cost. Subhash could have rejected the proposal but he showed a sense of far-sightedness. Swamiji aborted his conversation with Jaiprakash due to this issue. Communist were also in dilemma. Pt. Pant said in anger:

Any nation can have only one leader, like Germany has Hitler, Italy has Mussolini, Russia has Lenin. We are fortunate to have Gandhiji.

Swamiji, Shardool Vikram Singh and Nariman etc. requested to the head to apply vote of censor. Left wing announced their victory. In real the followers of non-violence, though temporarily, brought down the Caesar in Tripuri. Nehru, Jaiprakash and Lohia played the role of Brutus and Cassius. In this way a person selected through proper process was not allowed to function. Country wanted Subhash but Gandhiji was not in his favour. Jawaharlal Nehru Said". "Gandhi is India".

* Sharat Chandra Bose was elder brother of Subhas Chandra Bose.

Subhash said:

I do not consider any Mahatma or Parmatma (Lord) greater than the Nation. This time is to fight against British and not for compromise.

Gandhiji said:

British are good by heart, it is unethical to make use of their problems.

Subhash said: Problems for British are our opportunities.

Subhash and Swamiji's struggle against British was declared indiscipline. Congress issues notice:

Any person or group within congress cannot initiate any kind of Satyagrah without the permission of provincial congress.

This notice was aimed at Swamiji and Subhash. Swamiji was expelled from congress for 6 years and Subhash for 3 years. How unethical it was to expel a head duly elected by A.I.C.C. by working committee which has been dissolved. Proposal was as follows:

All India Congress Working Committee unanimously decides to suspend Shri Subhash Chandra Bose from the post of Head of Bengal Congress Committee. Mr. Bose shall not be able to hold any post in Congress for next three years. (Mahanayak: Vishwas Patil, Page 356)

Huge applause lauded the sessions of Subhash with a pronouncements of 'Vande Mataram' and in Swamiji's Session 'Kishan Raaj Kayam Ho, Iske Chalte Kuch Bhi Ho'. British pushed India into World War. Naharendu Dutt Majumdar signalled to Subhash Bose: "You must go underground."

In this backdrop Ramgarh session against the compromise

policies was held which was named by Subhash, Anti compromise conference. Congress Socialist Party had ditched Subhash and switched over to Gandhi. Both congress and Congress Socialist Party was financed by Tata, Birla, Bajaj. So, their class interest was elitistic and approximately same although C.S.P. professed socialism and Nehru was supports of C.S.P. Rather he was mentor of C.S.P. when Nehru switched over to Gandhi, leaders dependent on him also switched and ditched. M.N. Roy turned volte face and C.P.I. was at a fix, confused and ultimately went with Gandhi. Gandhi wanted to break the congress. He disliked its take over by Subhashists who were mostly left wingers anti-imperialistic and pro strugglers. Lohia was director of chanpatia suger mill owned by Birla in the beginning, J.P. was on pay role of Birla arranged by Gandhi. He was financed by Goenka Rana of mepar Sir Ganesh Dutt. Lohia and his followers were financed by Bajaj Pitty, Symans and Mohan Meakings. Minoo Masani at last became ot Tata. Sampornand, Genda Singh, Ramayn Roay Chandra Sekhar, Mohan Dharia, N.D. Wiwari, Ashok Mehtat, Mundrika Singh, Gurupal Swami Kalpnath Roy, Dinkar joined congress. Achyut patwardhan Joined Krishna Murri congress socialist party shook hands with Ambedkar in 1952. It lost its class conception and became bteam of Nehru congress.

RAMGARH SESSION AGAINST COMPROMISE

This concluded on 19-20 March 1940. Prior to it, a meeting was held on 8th January 1940 in Patna by Congress working committee in which Gandhiji said: "Britain is stuck in World War. Naturally if we oppose them now, their problems shall increase. Our internal problem is that the congress has too many members at present. When you people have made me the leader then you will have to follow my instructions... Thus you all must understand it clearly that compromise is in my nature. If someone wants to initiate a struggle I will not stop him but he will have to do so outside congress". Congress ordered its provincial cabinets to resign to be separated. Its purpose was to protect India from being pushed into world war but a signature of Lord Linlithogo pushed India into the world war. Congress only started individual civil disobedience in its response while congressmen continued to follow their dictators and make a drama by signing on the letters. On dictator's permission some number of people could be sent to jail under name of Satyagrah. Dictators were appointed in every region. Revolutionaries saw it as a drama to divert the attention of the public. Dr. Rajendra Prasad and Dr. Syed Mahmood did not participate due to their illness. Babu Krishna Singh was first Satyagrahi, his arrest saw opposition which included students also and Police lathi charged. Rajendra Prasad condemned this action of police. Anugrah Narayan was to be second Satyagrahi

but Rajendra Prasad did not approved because Satyagrah required guarantee of following of the directives. People were not allowed to participate and only selected leaders could participate in it. These measures ultimately helped British in war efforts. 53rd session of Congress was decided to be held in the dense forest in Ramgarh on 19-20 March 1940. This area in Chhota Nagpur is well protected in Jharkhand's region, where the wave of support of Subhash from east and that of Swamiji from Central Bihar could not reach. Regional ruler, Rajbahadur Kamakhya Narayan Singh was supporting Gandhiji in every manner. Regional Tribal leader and famous cricketer Jaipal Singh was also with Gandhiji.

Rajendra Prasad was heading the reception committee and Sub-head Shri Krishna Singh arranged for a huge tent near the bank of river Damodar. Good arrangements were made for the stay of representatives. Arrangements were made by Seth Dalmia.

Congress Session remained on papers due to heavy rain. Leaders had to settle by giving statements in newspapers. Historian Kalikingar Dutta writes:

Ramgarh Session was probably the shortest because on 19th March by 5.30 PM when the session was scheduled to start there was such a heavy rainfall that beautifully decorated tent was full of water.

Decoration was made by artist Upendra Maharathi at the cost of four lacs rupees in 1940 March.

ANTI COMPROMISE CONFERENCE

Radical and those seeking revolution were dissatisfied with the Gandhian Philosophy during the time of war. Congress was drifting towards British and Rajgopalachari, Bhulabhai Desai and Rajendra Prasad were continuously in contact of Jinnah

and on the other hand Gandhi, Nehru were in contact with British. A fierce force of public were demanding that Congress should not compromise with the Imperialists and should drop this attitude. For this purpose a parallel conference in Ramgarh at the same time was held. This conference was not disturbed by the rain as it was held on high place and when rain had stopped.

Conference was headed by Subhash Bose and Welcome committee by Swamiji. Dhanraj Sharma* was main organizer.

Tripuri congress in 1939 had people like Nambudaripad, P. Ramoorti, Sajjad Zahir, Harkrishna Mahtab, Sayyad Hassan and Ali Choudhury alongside Swamiji. Earlier M. N. Rai was of opinion that peasant council should remain independent but later on he changed his view that it should be under the Congress and local congress committee should be deemed as the peasant council and peasant council should be instead of being independent working under Congress umbrella.

Swamiji called out in Ramgarh Conference:

Friends,

I feel proud to welcome all the brave, famous and dedicated soldiers of freedom struggle to the All India Anti compromise Conference.

We have assembled here at a point when the freedom struggle is at a critical stage. The fierce form it is now going to take can either make our position stronger or destroy it. It is our duty to see that this becomes favourable and provides direction to the mass struggle. It is a strange situation wherein a great nation which has been kept stagnant for last 20 years and which has been continuously fighting an enemy who himself is now facing a threat in his own land, is kept in an inactive state, its pace has been slowed down and a fear has grabbed

* Dhanraj Sharma was from Belachhi Village Patna district. He was main ground leader of Forward Block in colonial Bihar.

it. Is this a time when we can think of compromise? Is it not the right time when we should attack fiercely and gain our freedom. British Imperialist which is struggling across the globe for its existence has been declining our demand for freedom in a rude manner and when we talk of negotiations they do not want to accept complete freedom. But this thought of compromise has carved so deep down in our political environment that we can't even think of a discussion without it. We have not understood the dangerous and life threatening impact of it. Many thinkers and revolutionaries present here have started thinking that the concept of complete independence can now only be achieved through negotiations. Our national bankruptcy and decline of national interests cannot fall beyond this point.

Looking Ireland as an ideal in this case is our foolishness. Ireland in last century gained a lot and made its rulers look foolish. It never bowed in front of them and neither praised London in any way. It stood tall and when opportunity came, even pushed them backwards. It has been continuously fighting and in the end the result of the struggle is—even in lack of negotiations, a form of freedom which is unsatisfactory for Irish people. Irish people are still burdened under social and economic obligations. Their independence is political and this is what we don't want here. We want complete independence from all forms of exploitations. We want to snatch away the rule from elite class to farmers and labour so that the social, political and economic exploitation of all producers can be stopped. In this way we want end of all form of exploitations by giving state power to the people. This can be only achieved through struggle without any compromise.

He further said :

After being elected as the president of Indian National

Congress Maulana Abul Kalam Azad* hinted towards a new form of civil disobedience movement and there was a wave of joy across. But deep thinkers didn't see anything in it. This statement was just an illusion so that the conference can be concluded with ease. First of all this new way of civil disobedience won't take us anywhere. It was like a mystery and people were fed up of mysteries. Though the discussion of joint cabinet was ambiguous and unclear—What we got to do with the war. But one thing was clear—path of compromise were being cleared.

After this came the Patna proposal of working committee, which was made for the Ramgarh conference. Same cunningness, ambiguity and shrewdness, all things were present in it. Nothing was clear in final form in the proposal. It presented only a blink for a struggle but was knowingly kept open for negotiations. After acceptance of this proposal congressmen issued statements which made things clear....This was nothing else but a combined assembly under the Legislative act of 1935 and a popular minister of Madras even went on to say that there is no need to initiate struggle immediately.

Swamiji asked:

Questions have been raised in London that has Congress closed the doors of negotiations. From this I have concluded that Congress has not closed it, it has been closed by Lord Jetland**.

This makes it clear that though the doors of negotiations were rudely closed by Lord Jetland, congress didn't find it right to close the doors on their end also and nation was compelled that they look forward to imperialist for their needs and public

* Maulana Abul Kalam Azad was President of All India Congress Committee from 1940 to 1946.

** Lord Jetland was Secretary of British Govt. incharge of Indian affairs.

who used to follow Mahatmas and their disciples shall be granted independence by an imperialist who lack emotions.

“As far as struggle is concerned, undoubtedly god is in favour of it in fifth para but it has also bounded it in a form which shall never be achieved.”

First condition is “if Congress is deemed fit for this task”.

Question is pertinent how shall this be examined? Swamiji asked.

Second Condition—When they shall be satisfied that strict discipline is being followed and creative programmes are being developed for independence.

Second condition's fulfilment was impossible. It was evident when whole nation declined to take of that promise of independence without any concrete deliverance.

Third Condition—If situations demand, emergency shall be called out.

This condition cannot fool anyone. But actual situation was that freedom struggle cannot give rise to any situation demanding emergency. Instead those looking to quit this struggle used to find such mediums. They would have never committed such mistake and our governance would clearly cut ways from this accountability and I must be allowed to say that they were afraid of emergency. Else today they would have seized the chance to find the means and such means were available to the leaders themselves. Above all these rules were so shrewd that they would have never allowed development of such circumstances. Thus waiting for our leaders in near future for any kind of struggle is a big mistake. But if I am proved wrong I shall be very happy.

But Gandhiji's articles destroyed these chances of struggle. In fact any personality lead in hands of a single person shall prove to be useless in the end and dependence of any nation

on any such person is its misfortune."

"Country is not prepared to fight...such a saying is baseless and stupid. Farmers, labour, youths and students know the history and are ready to move on, and all they need is a strong union. Public is suffering from starvation, thirst and poverty. They are paying a huge price for this and are eager to get rid from it. Their economic state is in dismay and they are at the last stage. Thus people now understand that dying in jail or through bullet is far better than dying each day. Then what is needed to call them "Ready". This insult cannot be acceptable in any way. In reality a leader who is not ready to fight is hiding his inability in this manner.

Ground reality was that problem affected the people in a bad way and the political wave that blew at that time brought them up in hope. As a result the lowest section of the society rose up to support the self-rising movement. Then above them are the middle and upper class and above them were the imperialists. Now no struggle can become active without invoking this section and the resultant force shall destroy the middle, upper class and the imperialists. Our leadership which is middle class knows this thing and fears that if such a struggle starts it shall be very destructive. Thus Gandhian followers were propagating that we are still "Not Ready" for such struggle.

We are not against Khadi or spinning wheel and accept their role in the country. But we cannot accept Gandhian philosophy as the base for future. Instead we believe that this shall be washed away in wave of time and shall be only found in the museums. Thus we have basic and principle differences with that philosophy. We are against four creative programmes of Gandhiji.

And we are not ready to accept non-violence as a policy. For Independence we are ready to give full and uncontrolled freedom to the national leadership. Any if this fails to provide freedom to public from all 3 forms of exploitation then other

means shall be adopted. Patient should have option of another doctor if one fails to cure him but Gandhiji is of only one view that non-violence is the only means. He is ready to lead only on this condition. We cannot follow this logic and history and thus have basic differences. I must clearly say that I don't agree with this and have large differences with Gandhian philosophy.

In short while we want revolution in all forms and fields, other group wants only corrective reforms. That's why they are eager for negotiations. Negotiation is the base of corrective reforms and is the basis of their lives also.

In these circumstances our path is cleared. If we would have not raised on time and not tried united efforts and were not involved in the counter actions, I fear a stage for negotiations would have been ready by now and congress would have attached country's fortune to it.

Political stagnation and inactiveness benefited people who seek chances through responding. That is the reason why they always oppose progressive and conclusive actions. We should learn this from the cabinet oath taking ceremony. Indecisiveness and delay was reason for our failure and their gain. Thus we should not loose time now. On one hand we should stop their action and on other should be also ready to directly strike by starting our own movement. Only in that situation we shall be able to protect the nation.

At last I regret that I have been poaching the matter of the president. I now request you to choose your leader and continue with the important programme.

COMMENT

In this Gandhiji's principle of colonial freedom has been criticised. Swamiji has kept the demand of complete independence which wants freedom from imperialists,

Zamindars and capitalist at once. He has unmasked upper and middle class who shy away from movements. Speech is full of demand of "British Quit India" and this marks the beginning of the freedom struggle along with Subhash since 19 March 1940. Gandhi was packaging master involved in gimmicks.

SUBHASH'S SPEECH at Ramgarh conference against compromise:

People have honoured me by choosing me as the leader of the Anti Compromise conference and along with this the responsibility assigned to me is very important. This honour represents the unification of forces across the country against the imperialists. Leading such a conference is no ordinary deal and this task become harder in the presence of Swami Sahajanand Saraswati. It is Swamiji's call which has brought us all here. He further said on pseudoleft: Most unfortunate is the claims of left wing about the conference. They have undertaken the task to stop and destroy it.

"It is important for every person that he observes the Patna proposal of congress and specially the last part. It has drawback in itself which weakens its importance....The way in this proposal was passed and the statement by Gandhiji after it has cleared that how doors of compromise are still kept open. Even Gandhiji's analysis of the civil disobedience cannot provoke confidence that this is the time for struggle. Thus conclusion is that this proposal has been passed due to pressure of left wing in the last 6 months".

Nation is expecting that congress working committee shall announce that the doors of compromise with imperialists have been closed for ever. But is it going to be announced. If yes then when?"

"Friends, those who think that congress is biggest force

against compromise have perhaps lost their memory, they must be reminded. Have they forgot that when war started, Gandhiji without consulting working committee went to Shimla and informed Viceroy that they are ready to support them without any condition".

Can't they see that Gandhiji is the dictator in congress and are his personal views worth implementing?

Did they forgot that few Right wing activists which also included few congressmen from working committee were considering a constitution council and which was elected through a separate Hindu-Muslim list and separate legislative councils?

Did they forgot that as soon as the war started they sidelined the demand of complete independence and started demanding for a fake constitutional council?

Did they forgot that after dissolving of provincial congress ministries some ministers were trying to regain the positions?

Don't they know that after heated discussion for passing proposal and statements, internally plans are being prepared for compromise?

"It is our misfortune that British have understood that congress leaders may give strong statements and pass proposal but they shall not fight in the end".

"Age of imperialism is about to end and socialism, democracy and independence are the new ways forward. India is standing on the critical juncture and it is open to us to become a part in it because world is waiting for our contributions and humanity and people of the country should not lose faith in this stage of uncertainty. Losing faith is the first incident".

Such situations are test for the leaders of the country.

Present situation has tested the leaders and unfortunately they have failed. We can unmask the leader's inability by just analysing the deepness of the problem and gain an important lesson and determine the modes and means for achieving goals of the future.

Poor policies and problems of leadership has created problems for a section of left wing. Words like unity, national stage and discipline have lost their importance. These people are not concerned with the realities and have forgotten in the frustration of slogans that a strong anti compromise policy is needed to gain victory in the national freedom struggle. Right wing politics and work style which unite us is no way a boon for us.

Biggest problem of the current scenario is that what we call as the Left wing is itself unclear and dejected. Future shall soon test left wing and if they fail to adopt correct actions, they shall be termed as fake right wing. It is the responsibility of Forward Block to prove their abilities that they are forward looking and unique. If we proceed on this path then we shall be called Left wing and new and real left wing members shall emerge out of it.

“It is important to tell that what does Left Wing means? The main aim today is the end of imperialism and gaining freedom for the people of India. When we shall gain freedom, then it shall be time for building up the nation and socialism shall be the base. In present a true left wing member is one who is ready to fight imperialists without any compromise. Those who shy away from imperialism or are ready for compromise with imperialists are in no way a left wing member.”

“We should work timely and should evaluate all things without any delay. Swami Sahajanand has made a very clear call and it is our duty to fulfil it through all our force and

efforts".

"The proposals passed in this conference should not only be implemented but fight against compromise policies should be started. I hope and believe that this conference shall form a base for a strong movement at national level".

Members of Forward Block shouted "Either give us death or freedom".

COMMENT

Thus Quit India Movement was started from Ramgarh in 1940.

Swamiji initiated a fight against British. He gave similar speeches on 6.4.40, 7.4.40 and 10.4.40 in Mangal Talab, Patna city, Bankipur Ground and Bihar Shareef respectively. He was jailed for 3 years. In this context the prison's note 1133 C is present. Quit India Movement was started by Sahajanand and Subhash from 19.3.1940 in which Gandhi half heartedly participated in 1942 temporarily.

No. 1133

Govt. of Bihar
Political Department
Special Section

From Y.A. Godboles I.C.S.

Chief Secretary to Govt.

To

The Secretary of the Govt. of India, Home Department, P.O.
Hi noo Ranchi, 7.5.1940

Sir

In continuation of my letter No. 1069 C dated the 30 April, 1940, I am directed to say that Swami Sahajanand Saraswati was charged with an Offence' under Rule 38 (5) read with Rules

38 (1) and 34 (6) sub-clause O and K of the Defence of India Rule for each of the three speeches delivered by him (1) at Mangle's Tank Patna City on 6th April 1940 and (2) at Bankipur Maidan on 7th April 1940 and (3) at Biharshareef on the 10th April 1940. He was tried by the Sub – Divisional Magistrate of Bihar and sentenced on the 28th April 1910 to undergo one year rigorous imprisonment on each of the three under charges. The sentences are to run consequently....

RISE OF INDIAN NATIONALISM AND POLITICAL PARTIES

Many Indian communists and socialists believed for a long time that the rise of Indian Nationalism started only after arrival of British and that India is a group of many nationalities and in reality it is a sub-continent and not a nation. This thinking was seeded by Charles Grant, Lord McCauley, Sir Charles Wood etc. and which was further adopted by Gandhi, Nehru alongwith Vipin Chandra, Sumit Sarkar, R. S. Sharma etc.

If this argument was correct then why did saints like Shankar Ramanujam, Ramanand and Vallabh etc. came from south and made Kashi and Mathura their centers. Why Gautama Buddha did went on to propagate religion in Saranath? Why Samudra Gupta and Chandra Gupta attacked Madras and Kandhar respectively? Rajendra Chola's Bihar victory, Ashoka's Kalinga victory and Samudra Gupta's Victory over south and Lalitaditya's victory in North-west were all signify what?. India has remained one from cultural point of view. To further strengthen this fact there are 4 Dhams, Sapteerth and 52 Shaktipeeth were established in four ends of India. Nalanda and Taxila universities were not for any particular region. Acceptance of Valmiki, Vyas, Kalidas, Baanbhat were not limited to a particular region. Scholars like Kapil, Patanjali, and Gautama etc. are praised and accepted all over the country.

In this way it is clear that India is not a sub-continent which

is collection of nations and nor its nationality is the result of foreign educated elites and British. This raises a question that has only congressmen, socialists and communists participated in the freedom struggle or general people have also participated in it? We believe that the freedom struggle was not initiated by the officer cadre but by the common public. Modern India has emerged up from these struggles – thus it's an ancient nation and not a new one.

Which section did congress supported before 1947? What were their means and aim? What were the purpose of their movements against imperialism? After struggle of 1920, salt movement in 1930-32 and then again after ten years movement in 1942. Then came the era of Crips Mission, Cabinet Mission, Rajgopalachari* Mission, Vavel Mission and Mountbatten Mission. Has the freedom gained as a result of these struggles reduced the impact of foreign money, foreign culture and foreign ruling system in the country? This section is being written to find answer of these questions and to underline the role of Swamiji in these answers. Public includes Farmers, Labours, small traders, small salaried person, artisan etc. Elites include Zamindars, rulers, Mahajans, capitalists, foreign educated, lawyers, professors etc. Support for Congress, Socialist and Communists in India were from these elites only. Gandhi, Rajendra Prasad, Narendra Dev and Numbudaripad were from large Zamindari sections. Lohia was a new capitalist and Motilal Nehru was also from a ruling class and a capitalist. Communist leader of Bihar Indradeep Sinha was of Zamindari background. Mental thought process of all of them were influenced by Thoro, Tolstoy, Roja, Ruskin, Laski, Trotsky, Roja and Brown etc. All of them ignored their followers and helped in expelling

* Rajgopalachari became first Indian Viceroy of Independent India. Whereas first Viceroy was Lord Mountbatten who was Britisher. This was shameful for independent India.

Subhash Bose from Congress and unanimously agreed on division of country. This raises a question whether their struggle against imperialism was friendly or was there any enmity. On which sectional struggles was the independence of 1947 achieved and what was the role of Swamiji in that? Relying on primary sources answers to these questions have been suggested and struggles have been highlighted.

During the colonized rule two types of social forces came into being. One was peasant council which had farmers, tribal, labour, urban poor and artisans. Second was Zamindars, rulers, Mahajan, capitalists and Nawabs etc. Protector of their properties were British themselves. Second Section were pillars of British rule in India on whose support was British flourishing in India. First section was in dejection and was subject to exploitations, direct exploitation through Mahajan and Zamindars and indirect exploitation through capitalists and foreign rulers. Distinction between both was not very clear nor there any conflict between the two. Elites class helped British to crush the Revolutionary efforts and as per the strategy sometimes portrayed themselves as a part of the struggle. This was the reason of their victory on 15th August 1947. Empire helped them in grabbing the power.

Tribal faced the most difficulty due to imperialism. They were pushed out of forests and shrubs. They were in dejection due to money lenders and Zamindars. As a result following were the main struggles:

1. Sanyasi Struggle	1763	Bengal
2. Tilka Manjhi	1770	Bhagalpur
3. Virbhoom Struggle	1790	Virbhoom
4. Chuar Struggle	1770-90	Midnapur, Barakunda, Manbhoomi

5. Padak Struggle	1817	Odisha
6. Bahavi Struggle	1831-47	Bengal
7. Kol Struggle	1831-32	Chota Nagpur
8. Bheel Struggle	1818-31	Khan Desh
9. Koli Struggle	1824-48	Maharashtra, Gujarat
10. Khasi Struggle	1829-33	
11. Santhal Struggle	1855-56	Santhal Paragana, Bhagalpur Virbhoom
12. Chera Struggle	1857-58	Palamu, Nilambarshah Pitambarshah
13. Munda Struggle	1890-95	Ranchi, Birsa Munda
14. Fadke Struggle		Maharashtra
15. Allori Shri Rama Raju	1922-24	Mudem Rampa
16. Tana bhagat Struggle	1914	Jatara Uraav, Ranchi
17. Tatya Bheel Struggle	—	Madhya Bharat

Second exploited group is of artisans. English either pushed them into industry or else changed their profession to end the competition in business. Thus they were forced to work as labour. This added the burden on agriculture front.

Third section is of farmers. Several taxes were imposed on farmers. Their exploitation was on the peak. Swamiji prepared a list of types of exploitations and published it through book named *Gaya Zile Ke Kishano Ki Karun Kahani* in the mid decade of 1930. This book provides the explanation of different forms of exploitation and expected backdrop of the peasant revolution. Prevailing circumstances have been well narrated.

Fourth exploited section is of daily labour that does not have any guarantee of wages. Those who got monthly salary, they were not real proletariat for Swamiji. Swamiji's proletariat were who got daily wages and were farm labours. He considered

them to be symbol of unique energy, symbol of Maharudra and their revolution as Maharudra Ka Mahatandav.

Fifth exploited section was of small farmers, whom Swamiji considered the propeller of the revolution. As for communist party salaried class was the propeller and they were not ready to accept the farmers in the roles at par. They wanted to keep peasant council under them and were against cultural and personal freedom. Due to these questions swamiji had differences with communists. Sixth exploited section was that of small traders. Swamiji was in favour of unification of all these exploited sections.

Russia and Britain turned friends after Russia was attacked by Germany. Thus Indian communist also separated themselves from the mass struggle and advocated 'Grow More' philosophy and started favouring British. Swamiji remained annoyed with the communist party over this starting from 1943 to 1946.

In this way it is clear that those who considered themselves as the representatives of the public lacked clarity in programme and were in dwindling situation. Personalities like Swami Sahajanand and Subhash Bose could not achieve their objectives because a section of Indian Left wing were vocal, opportunist, Inter competitive, ambitious, desirous of being in media and influenced by strange acts. India could not be liberated from the imperialism and Mountbatten remain Viceroy even after Independence. Constitution was not framed by the general people. Limited voters who were pillars of Imperilaism were the only voters. Consituliton committee was headed by Lord Sacchidanand. There were a lot of 'Lords' in the constitution committee. Due to Elites continued relations with imperialism the dream of Swamiji, Subhash and Bhagat Singh remained unfulfilled. For this Indian Left Wing is accountable. Capitalism in India rose not due to conflicts in Indian society but as it was pushed by the British. Jamshed Ji Tata, Ghanshyam

Das Birla, Bangur and Goenka etc had huge properties. Middleman-ship was promoted in India to push the capitalism so that growth of Indian wealth can be constrained and thus British continued to loot India. Following were the father of Bombay Plan of 1944: All were comprador, dependent bourgeoisie. No one was national bourgeoisie.

1. J R D Tata
2. Ghanshyam Das Birla
3. Purshottam Das Thakur
4. Shri Ram

Professor K. D. Wadia and K. T. Merchant has commented:

Fathers of Bombay Plan think that it is necessary to unify foreign and Indian wealth for future investment.

Those companies which called themselves Swadeshi were dependent on the Foreign technology for producing Capital Goods. In this way either the goods are imported or for production in India, machinery from Foreign was used, dominance of foreign wealth continued.

D. H. Buchanan writes:

Indian wealth was Appended of Britain.

Another speciality of Indian Capitalism was that unlike Europe Indian Capitalist market did not destroy the base but instead maintained a balance with it. Source of Indian Capital were rulers of Mysore, Gwalior, Baroda, Travancore, Darbhanga and Burdhaman. Later on Natuotai from Madras became the largest economic power in South India by joining hands with A. S. Harve Mill. Capitalists used the socialists to compel the feudalists to provide the wealth. Indian socialist lost their path in this transaction and lost contact with their cadre. Dabur and Petit were brokers of British. Premji Pandya was also a Broker.

All 3 were parsis. Banamji Horamsanji Wadia was also Parsi. King of Rajpital and Deewan of Bhawnagar did business with Ranchorlal of Amhedabad and Chota Lal. Malin Bhagat of Sarabhai group used to work for Karam Chandra Shroff. They were accompanied by Englishman Mr. White.

S. S. Rootnagur writes:

Indian Cotton mills were established with the help of Lancashire's machinery producers and exporters. Indian cotton mills were given thrice at rates of Britain and Coal at 6 times.

Garden writes:

Being agent of European firms was common for Indian industrialists.

D. H. Wacha, President of Congress in 1901, was member of council of viceroy.

On 28th May 1992 Birla wrote to J. M. Keanes:

All Birla House wants is a good place in the House of King George V. (P. T. Papers file 107 Part II) (Suniti Kumar Ghosh, Page 323).

Three times president of Congress Dadabhai Naroji commented:

Indian educated class is a strong bond for Indians with British in India. (Poverty and British rule in India, Page 50).

All these were born as a result of education policy of Charles, Grant, Lord McCauley and Sir Charles Wood.

According to Gokhale:

British Rule in India is unchangeable and firm.

According to Surendra Nath Banerjee:

Acting in faith with British relations , is not to imbalance but to further nurture the bases.

Mahatma Gandhi Writes:

End of British Raj will be a loss for us.

“Queen Victoria’s announcement in 1858 is the Liberty Charter”.

(C.W.M.G. 1969, 187, 289, 1979, 377, 398, 431, 432, 117, 6-7 Vol. III 246 Ran Padmawat, page 2266) (Suniti Kumar Ghosh, Page 13-14 India and Raj).

Birla himself used to work as bridge between Britain and Gandhi. Birla wrote to the personal secretary of Lord Linlithgow in 1940:

“No one is as faithful to you in India as I am”.

On 3rd July he wrote to C Rajgopalachari:

I fell that in front of Bapu and Viceroy I have presented right picture of both for each other. (Birla in the Shadow of Mahatma, Page 233)

Even biographer of Birla has approved this.

Sir Purshottam Das Thakur and Birla were of view.

“Indian freedom is through compromise with British capitalism”.

J.L. Nehru in his narration in India and World, 1936, London writes:

Indian Capitalist are usually dependent on Foreign Money. This is specially controlled by foreign banking. After WWI Britain promoted Indian Capitalist by giving them more money. Existence of Indian Swadeshi industry marks the growth of British Capital in India.

In 1944, Lord Vavel prepared to send an Indian council under the leadership of JRD Tata to Europe and America which visited in 1945. It searched for the opportunities for Joint ventures and Capitalism. Walchand and Chrysler, Kirloskar and British Oil, Infield and Birla, Tata and ICI's joint venture were the proposals discussed. Indian capitalist continued their dependence on foreign capital. In Technology driven industry techno locally advanced firms gradually replaces the equity holding in the joint venture over period of time – this is a rule. Wealth of Birla rose by 4 times during first World War. Brijmohan Birla started the work of Jute, Broker and Gunny bags in Calcutta in 1918. Jugal Kishore earned a lot and G. D. Birla bought a Land in Ranchi. By 1935, Birla had 10 large industries and by end of W.W. II.

Birla were in favour of colonization and British relations. As per G. N. Gadgill's book "Inside the government" India Pakistan partition was a result of tax imposed on Birla by Finance Minister in Interim government. (Liyakat Ali). Maulana Azad also supper fees view of Gandhi.

Indian Capitalism was dependent on imperialism and wealth of middlemen. This had huge impact on Indian politicians. In recent times in 2003 Khushwant Singh published an article in a Hindi Daily wherein he has compared the cleverness of Mountbatten against the Indian Politicians of the erstwhile era. He has written that independence was result of circumstances instead of struggle by the politicians. Similar views are expressed by Sudarshan Birla in his article published in 2003 wherein he writes:

Though country gained constitutional freedom but it was not due to some person but due to circumstances. This is the truth of 15th August 1947. Freedom was not complete but constitutional where the pressure of circumstances born due to WW-II was playing major role.

Muslim capitalist section comprised of A.S. Isfani, Sir Rafudin Aadam Ji, Abdulla Haroon and Habib. These and Muslim bureaucrats in the greed of business started supporting Pakistan after March 1940. Poor people of Pakistan could not understand these tricks. If Indian left wing would have participated correctly in the Peasant movements, circumstances of partition would have never occurred. But they were not with Swamiji or Subhash and as a result country has to face the misfortune. So called Left had kept in abeyance the peasant movement during Second World War.

From the above discussion it is clear that the main force of Indian revolution were farmers, labour and students etc. but due to circumstances their leadership got segregated. In such circumstances governance went to Capitalists and elites through approval of British on the August 15, 1947.

Shailendranath Srivastav writes in his book :”

“British threw a piece of loaf to curb Indians. Lord Linlithonge in his conversation with Gandhiji and others signalled that if you will support us we shall grant the status of Dominion, you will have right of self-rule and right to run the country as you desire, while being part of the Commonwealth”. Due to this statement many agreed.

Similarly he writes in page 43:

Rajgopalachari got the proposal approved in Congress that India should fight with British in World War which shall result in its freedom and thus a govt. is formed at center which works under Viceroy.

This proposal of war passed in presence of Gandhiji. Gandhiji's blessings were with Rajgopalachari and Bhulabhai who proposed almost partition to Jinnah in 1942-43.

The speech given by Ganhiji in congress session in September 1934 was published in 'Europe' Magazine on 15th

March. Roma Rola in her book Gandhi's Life and Vision writes: In his speech Gandhiji rejected socialism. I was stunned by his thought. I remains unable to free himself from such a thought then political works might not be arranged."

In future his suspicion turned correct.

Swamiji spread the movement at the national level and actualized the dream of Subhash. Revolutionaries created trouble for British but in lack of adequate national presence and limited capacities could not stop them. Gandhi's policy of non-violence, boycott was also not able to stop the system. Peasant council which had widespread only created tension for the British. Farmer's son were the labour, soldiers and students. Lohia also participated in many movements with Swamiji but later moved to Gandhiji's side and ditched the Kisan Movement.

Shailendranath Srivastav writes in his book *Jaiprakash Narayan*:

Anyway, J. P. got inspired by Subhash departure to foreign and started seeking similar opportunities. Now the question of sources and mediums was irrelevant what mattered was the question of doing or not doing.

But this was important to Swamiji. Jaiprakash had a long discussion with Swamiji in Hazaribagh Jail in 1940-41. Swamiji writes:

We started the conversation. I said that the only source of cadre and funding should be farmers and labours only, someone else should not be there. The method of member and cadre selection which you have described seems to imply that only middle class people will join. In this way all three things, people, money and sources shall be from outside. Farmer-labour shall not have any say. These are the things needed J.P. said that cadre money, press will be

from urban middle class and propertied class you might initiate the revolution based on cadre from urban middle class by chatting slogan, Seth will provide you requisite money and press. You may succeed but it will not be people's democratic revolution. But how that revolution shall be of farmers and labour, it is difficult for me to understand.

"All I knew and have read is that the rules should be now under the farmers and labour and you might call it revolution or anything else. Till the time leaders and fighters are not born amongst them till then they cannot expand. All of them fight and face lathi charge and bullets but their leaders are often outsiders. As a result inspite of revolution nothing has been achieved. Their situation is as it was".

"Thus we must be firm on the fact that the fight which farmers and labours are proposing, funds, people and sources should be accumulated from them. There is no other way".

ROLE OF PEASANT COUNCIL* IN CULTURAL UPRISING

Cultural uprising in Bengal was over by 1916 by dint of influence of Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Ishwar Chandra Vidya Sagar, Bankim Chandra Chaterjee, Ramkrishna Paramhans, Vivekanand, Faraji, Arvind, Ravindra Nath Tagore, Keshav Chandra Sen, Michael Madhusudan and of sanyasi struggle and Bahavi struggle. In the same flow Bengal was active and its literature, art, poetry, science and industries had a flow of brave individuals which was also influencing the social and political movements. New wave rose up in Punjab due to Guru Govind Singh and Dayanand Saraswati which led to rise of Ranjit Singh and created the backdrop for the Revolution of 1857. As a result personalities and organizations like Bhagat Singh, Gadar Party,

* Peasant Council means Kisan Sabha.

Singh sabha, Joravar Singh came into existence and thus the uprising of Punjab was completed by the start of 20th century. In southern India this process reached its height due to Ranadey, Lokmanya Tilak, Jyotiba Phule, Narayan Guru, Vasudev Balwant Phadke, Chafeker brothers and Sawarkar etc.

But in Bihar movement was absent in 20th century. Reason was stuck till 1920 absence of social movements like Sikh society, Arya Samaj, and Brahma Samaj etc. neither science was present nor anyone to propel the society. Society of Bihar and eastern UP were in stagnation. Caste based councils were led by kings, rulers, lords, Zamindars and Sir. They themselves were rotten ones. Thus up-liftment of society could not be expected from them and neither able leaders, writers, scientists and scholars could be produced in such a society. Bihar was stuck in medieval era mind-setup to 1920 decade.

Formation of caste based councils in Bihar is provided below:

1. Kayastha Mahasabha, 1887
2. Bhumihar Brahman Mahasabha, 1887, reformation in 1892.
3. Saryuparin Brahman Mahasabha, 1905
4. Rajpoot Mahasabha, 1906
5. Ravani Kahar Mahasabha, 1906
6. Marwari Young man association, 1907
7. Dusadh Sabha, 1911
8. Goap Mahasabha, 1912
9. Kewat Mahasabha, 1912
10. Kurmi Mahasabha, 1912
11. Nai Mahasabha, 1912

Caste based council has the motive of getting involved in politics. They used to praise British and used to talk about the upliftment, education and used to trap farmers through caste

based issues and move them away from peasant council. They aimed to fulfil the motives of the leaders of these councils through feeling of competition. Most of the lawyers, teachers, professors and doctors in Bihar were mostly Bengalis. By 1918 they started facing competition from Kayasthas, which were from educated class of Bihar. Their leaders were Lord Sacchidanand and Dr. Rajendra Prasad. First seed of sectional struggle between Bengalis and Kayasthas was sowed in Bihar. Hasan Ali, Imam Ali helped Kayasthas in forming new High Court in Patna and thus parting Bihar from Bengal. Due to reformist Langat Singh and Ganesh Dutt a section of Bhumihar Brahmins developed flair for education. Rajendra Prasad and Ganesh Dutt both were from Zamindari background and their competition sowed a seed of Kayastha-Bhumihar sectional struggle. Anugrah supported Rajendra Prasad while Shri Krishna Singh was helped by Nehru. Due to competition between Anugrah and Shri babu third seed of Rajpoot-Bhumihar struggle was laid in Bihar. All these events took place before Swami Sahajanand.

After Bhagat Singh revolutionary feel defeatism in the politics and revolutionaries were looking for setting up farmer-labour movement. Greatness of Bhagat Singh and Bismil can be attributed to this vision. Motilal Nehru, Jinnah, Malviya, C. R. Das and Vitthalbhai got separated from congress by fighting with Gandhiji and started searching for an alternative and they ultimately felt hopeless only. Gandhiji himself was sitting quite after Chauri Chaura incidence in 1922 and dejection was all around. Independent Party and Swaraj Party all missed their objectives. In such circumstances Swamiji provided a new wave of enthusiasm and a new wave to the peasant movement and provided a halt to the surrenders compromise with the Empire. Upheaval started in the society and as a result society was pushed towards uprising. Benipuri, Premchandra, Bechain

Sharma, Mahashweta Devi, Bhishma Sahani, Rahul, Nagarjuna, Maya Gupta, Ramdayalu Pandey, Faneeshwar Renu, Agyey and Mulkraj Anand were result of such upheaval. These people staged with Swamiji at following places and they narrated in following books:

1. Rahul Sanskratayan	Aamwari, Seewan Bihar	Naye 1930-50 Bharat Ke Naye Neta
2. Rambriksh Benipuri	Bihar Muzaffarpur	Mujhe Yaad Hai 1920-50
3. Mahasweta Devi	Komilla, Bangladesh	Agni Garbha
4. Nagarjuna	Aamwari	Balachnama 1936-50
5. Mayagupta	Hazaribagh	Hunkar 1940-45
6. Ramdayal Pandey	Patna	Janta(Co-editor) 1940-50
7. Renu	Purnia	Maila Aanchal, parti Parikatha
8. Agyey	Meerut	- 1936
9. Prabhakar manche	Baghpat	- 1936
10. Mulkraj Anand	Tripuri	- 1939
11. Pt. Padam Singh Sharma	Western UP	- 1930 onward
12. Ramdhari Singh Dinkar	Begusarai	- 1930-50

Shri Krishna Singh was secretary of provincial peasant council. He opened many colleges in Munger and participated in Peasant movements. On becoming CM, based on the model of Tennessee valley of America he planned construction of 5 dams: Badua Dam, Mayurakshi Dam, Gatalsood Dam, Kharagpur Dam, Tillaiya Dam. Manure plant was set up in Sindari. Oil refinery in Barauni. Setting plant in flood controls was almost impossible. He developed a base through support from

backward, dalit and muslim sections in the politics of Bihar. Mahesh Babu opened two colleges in Muzaffarpur. Similarly, Shatrughan Singh opened colleges at Jahanabad, Hasua. Krishnakant Babu's father Shri Narayan Singh opened colleges in Seewan. Inspired by Swami Sahajanand many colleges were opened in Bihar and magazines were published. Swamiji was associated with following magazines

<i>Magazine</i>	<i>Editor</i>	<i>Location</i>
1. Yogi	Rambriksh Benipuri	Gauraiya Kothi
2. Lok	Rambriksh Benipuri,	Samsatipur, Patna
Sangrah	Swami Sahajanand Saraswati	
		Yamuna Karyi
3. Janta	Rambriksh Benipuri	Patna
4. Hunkar	Swami Sahajanand Saraswati	Patna
	Yamuna Karyi	
	Rahul Sanskratayan	

Swamiji's articles were published in *Kishan Bulletin—Delhi*, *Viplav—Lucknow*, *Sangharsh—Lucknow*, *Vishal Bharat—Calcutta*, *Janta*, *Hunkar (Patna)* and *Lok Sangrah, (Samastipur) Bhumihar Brahman (Calcutta)*.

Kishan Bulletin was edited by Indulal Yagik, *Vishal Bharat* by Batuk Dev Sharma, *Viplav* by Yashpal, *sangharsh* by Narendra Dev, *Janta* was by Benipuri.

Subhash Bose spoke in 450 conferences in Bihar in 1939-40 before Ramgarh anti compromise meeting under Swamiji.

Swamiji was of view that the movements in the country could be operated only under leadership of Subhash and all left fronts should be united for complete freedom from British. Seeing the crowd present in the Ramgarh session organized by Swamiji, Subhash developed understanding that the only person under whom revolution can be started in the country is Swami

Sahajanand Saraswati. This opinion was expressed in forward magazine published on 20th April 1940 and in Berlin Broadcast, 1942.

SWAMIJI AND SUBHASH CHANDRA BOSE

Following are the abstracts from Subhash's Speech during Ramgarh conference during 19-20 March 1940:

This conference represents the unity amongst the forces against the imperialist in the country to unmask the forces negotiating with the Imperialist. Leading such a conference is no ordinary deal and this task become harder in the presence of Swami Sahajanand Saraswati. It is Swamiji's call which has brought us all here.

Abstract from Subhash Bose's Berlin Broadcast in August 1942:

I assure that as soon as above programme shall be implemented, governance system shall struck. In this context I want to remind that farmers only play decisive role in non-violent guerrilla warfare. I am pleased to know that there is a leader in many regions, Bihar and central province. I firmly believe that Swamiji Sahajanand and other peasant farmers who along with forward block started struggle much before Mahatma Gandhi shall provide direction to the movement for its success. Thus I appeal to swamiji and other members of the peasant council to come forward and provide direction to this movement in this decisive moment. We want freedom for common public, labour and farmers and thus it is the duty of these people to come forward when the task of nation building is being undertaken. This is a logical claim that people who have fought for the freedom gets the rule and governance after the independence.

Swamiji in his book *Jung Aur Rastriya Azadi* has explained about his opinions expressed on the central peasant working committee's proposal at All India Peasant council held in Nagpur on 12-13 February 1942:

If we want our good then we will have to fight alongwith the forces fighting against Fascism which include Soviet Russia, China, America, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Philippines and recently overtaken Europe and Asia. First from Japanese side and then from British and as a result we shall be crushed in between. It is immature to think that British shall move away after attack of Japanese and Japanese shall gain the hold. When this didn't happen in Malaya, Burma etc. then it shall never happen here. There is no other way other than fighting against Japan with full force?

Swamiji questioned:

“Those who say that Japan shall provide us freedom have forgotten that they are not only destroying Korea and Farmosa for last 30-40 years but have also completely destroyed Manchuria. It cannot provide food grains to its own people, how shall it provide it to us?”

“Those who are saying that we should compete with Japan in a peaceful manner and that we are on wrong path in these dangerous times should be spared. In a circumlocutory manner they want to say that Japanese should be invited here, even if they have been unable to deal Hindu-Muslim riots, poverty, theft incidences with those peaceful means and while these incidences are on rise, they want to deal with brutal Japan with those means...these people should be considered immature.... Thus all we need is our own government.

“At any cost volunteers from the panchayats and public should be assembled who can protect people from external

forces, this has also been proposed."

"Peasant council believes that fascist forces and Japan along with the imperialist shall be demolished through such efforts and thus separate efforts shall not be needed".

"Proposal says that farmers, labour and other people's demand should be immediately met which shall provoke confidence that government is for our help and it's our duty to help them. These demands are other than national demands. National demands are common for all. Announcing complete freedom of India, granting full right to prepare structure for the governance and establishing a government immediately are the national demands."

"Third, matter is of helping, Russia and China and establishing Soviet friendly mission at places. In fact this proposal has no serious demands which should be considered. But if immature and people without information demand for such demands then we shall be forced to accept it."

Swami Sahajanand Saraswati

Bihta (Patna)

Date 07.05.1942

Swamiji distributed this pamphlet after his release from jail. One point was attack on Subhash on his Japan supportive policies. Subhash had to visit Germany instead of Russia due to alliance between Russia and Britain and has to form union with Japan for being their against the British. Swamiji wanted Subhash to stay in country and lead the country through revolution with help of Students, labour, youths, soldiers and farmers against the British and Gandhiaites. A section of communist party and socialist party were in agreement with this and they appeared in Ramgarh conference against compromise. But a large section under P. C. Joshi and Jaiprakash from communist-socialist still considered Gandhiji as their

leader and the efforts for Left wing union was being pushed further. Thus Subhash was forced to rush outside. He was not a Japanese agent. If he would have been alive then like Aang Sung of Burma would have fought against imperialist Japanese. No one will doubt that this was stopped only due to his untimely death. He started developing differences with Japanese and when Subhash initiated war then it was mistake of Swamiji and Communist Parties by not supporting him. Swamiji committed this mistake due to unclear policy of communist intending to protect China and Russia from fast aggressing Japanese.

Swamiji criticised Communist love of British in his speeches in East Bengal, Shakurabad, Jahanabad, Warsliganj in 1945-46, who left peasant council for British and started propagating their policy of more production and their one section was even spying the revolutionaries. When they broke into CPI and CPI (M), all clandestine actions were revealed. Swamiji was against Gandhiji's approval for forming a union with British without struggle. Gandhiji had full confident in British's policies and Swamiji propagated 'rights to develop own structure of governance'. Swamiji's line was more dependent on national pride and self-dependence rather than on imperialists for which he was ready for violence through organizing militia.

Swamiji started 'British Quit India' movement with Subhash in Ramgarh in 1940 and delivered fierce speeches in different parts of Bihar in April for which he was jailed for 3 years under rigorous imprisonment. In opposition of his arrest, Subhash Bose wrote an article in his magazine on 20th April 1940:

"Swami Sahajanand is a magical name in our world. Doubtlessly he is the greatest peasant leader in the country and hero of people across the country. Getting him as the head in the anti compromise conference was our fortune. Forward Block was lucky to have him and we were fortunate to have

him in form of aggressive, friendly and scholar form in left front. We have decided to celebrate 28th April as *Swami Sahajanand Day* to oppose his arrest. We congratulate him for the popularity gained through arrest and imprisonment. His arrest shall inspire lakhs of people for breaking the barriers and shall get involved people whole heartedly. This time is for struggle and we shall not move away from it.”

“Swamiji is behind the bars and has left a will behind. We should learn lessons from him, socialism should learn from his deep thinking. During his arrest he has appealed to mass to get involved in the movement and do not waste time in considering options. Swamiji’s arrest is a challenge for the nation and we accept this challenge. British government should see and mark that country is behind Swamiji. We need that we should increase our efforts in ‘Either Freedom or Death’ action. Freedom shall surely be there on our great land.

In reality struggle against British has been led by people like Birsa Munda, Bhagat Singh, Swami Sahajanand and Subhash Bose. These are the true forgotten, unsung heroes of colonial India.

MOUNTBATTEN* ON END OF EMPIRE

AIM

The aim of British government was to establish India as an independent democracy within the Empire. Responsible self government, first in local and then in national affairs, was the British objective in India. A federation of, more or less, self governing provinces, around a centre responsible for such matters as communication and defence was the protected pattern.

* Mountbatten was last viceroy of colonial India and first Viceroy of independent India.

FREEDOM

Freedom from what and movement to what goal? The erratic almost casual growth of the Empire in India had meant that some forty per cent of landscape of India was not properly British at all, but consisted of a plethora of states responsible not to the Indian government in Delhi but to the British crown. How were these princely states to be fitted into the jigsaw of independent India?

MUSLIM SEPARATISM

Muslim separatism was never a British creation. Many years after the system of separate electorates had been imposed, Hindu and Muslim were still united in their opposition to the British and support for a greater India. The limited encouragement which the British gave it could not have made the difference between its survival and extinction. In 1935 came what should have been the next great step in India's peaceful march to independence. Inspite of its imperfections, it prepared the way for the triumph of Congress at the forthcoming election in British India (1934). That triumph proved a step on the path to partition and the massacres. Not until 1936 did Jinnah argue that only if Hindu and Muslim were organized separately could they understand and work with each other, not till the year after that did he formulate the dreadful concept of a "Muslim Nation". Even then a united, independent subcontinent was still the aim of the Indian leaders, but more and more, they were formulating policies from a sectarian, rather than a pan-Indian point of view. When Nehru-Liyakat signed on Cabinet Mission Plan which envisaged to keep India united but federal in three groups of Muslim, Hindu and composite to majority, Gandhi wrecked it and congress with drew earlier approval, Jinnah followed suit. Latter on Jinnah has approved Cabinet Mission Plan signed by Nehru and Liyakat to keep

India federal and intact but Gandhi favoured strong centre and weak provinces. So, he wrecked the plan.

SUBHASH FACTOR

With Japan's entry into the war and the over-running of Burma, the threat of Indian dissidence became all the more alarming. Pressed by the labour and liberal members of his coalition government and by his American allies, Churchill reluctantly conceded that some step should be taken to break the deadlock. "I hate Indians" he petulantly remarked to Aumery in 1942, "they are a beastly people with a beastly religion." But once Churchill* had agreed that Cripps should visit India to find a basis on which independence could be granted after the war, he stared back and allowed his colleague to do his best.

The Japanese would be quick to exploit any disaffection through the renegade Indian National Army and its leader Subhash Chandra Bose, and was convinced that his security lay as could be contrived. To the three "ms" monsoon, malaria and moral, Mount Batten was soon to add a fourth problem—India. He knew how totally he depended on the subcontinent for communications, manpower and supplies on India during Burma war.

Note—Mr. Atlee* admitted in 1956 when he was guest in Calcutta—"It is because of the fear of Mr. Subhash Chandra Bose that we left India. The effect of Gandhi-Nehru combine was minimal." He told this to Chakravarti who was incharge of governor of West Bengal. Chief of Army Auchin Lek had clearly reported to Viceroy that because of Subhash factor and I.N.A. the Indian Army has become unreliable.

Source—India's War of Independence through Kisan

* Churchill was Prime Minister of England during World War Second.

** Atlee was Prime Minister of England in post war period. In his tenure India was freed from open bondage. He gave its credit to influence of Subhash.

Documents. Manohar Publishers 2014, Raghav Sharan Sharma.

INDEPENDENT PAKISTAN

Muslim League had accepted, in principle, a plan for a federation, (1946) while Congress had moved some way at least in the same direction. There negotiations struck. Ironically, Congress would have accepted with relief in 1947, the terms that they rejected in 1946, but by that time it was too late—The Muslim League now would settle for nothing less than the creation of an Independent Pakistan. Mount Batten assured Jinnah “he would not recommend any solution which was unacceptable to him.”

Note—Muslim League had accepted Gopalachari formulae, Bhula Bhai Desai formulae and Cabinet Mission formulae. Nehru and Liakat Ali had even signed the cabinet mission plan. Afterwards, at the behest of Bardolai and Gandhi, Nehru tilted volte face. After that, call for “direct action” came from League leading to massacre of thousands in Calcutta and, thereafter, parting of path became the only alternative.

PRINCIPAL TARGETS

Who his principal target must be? For the Hindus, they were Nehru, Gandhi and the Congress party boss Sardar Patel; for the Muslims Jinnah alone would take the decisions that mattered, though his right hand man, Liakat Ali Khan, also merited attention.

Wavel had written, you know Nehru, quixotic, emotional, socialistic.

In Jinnah, Mountbatten found no such flexibility.

Nehru had presented Jinnah “as a monster of negativism, a man who would agree to nothing, because it might spilt his followers if he did.”

Mountbatten gave comment on Nehru’s observation.

"Jinnah used negativism to achieve positive ends; by saying no, he inexorably closed all avenues except the one leading to the only affirmative he would accept—an Independent Pakistan. He was cold." (5 April 1947).

Mountbatten opined about Gandhi:

"He may be a saint but he seems also to be a disciple of Trotsky".

Gandhi told the Assam leaders on 15 December 1946 that "If they entered the section C in mission plan, I will say that Assam had only manikins and no men."

Gandhi wrecked chances of unity and proposed a most mischievous resolution but Patel had opposed him strongly. On 17 Jan. 1947 Lord Wavell told Rajgopalachari :

"He might have candidly attributed the refusal to Mission Plan to Gandhi."

V.P. Menon commented : (Adviser of Mountbatten)

"Gandhi wrecked the chances of unity. It was cleverness all the way, never statesmanship".

Gandhi's famous offer to Jinnah in 1944 envisaged :

"Power to the congress, which would workarout the partition".

Ambedkar called it a snare. 15 August was chosen because it was the day of defeat and surrender of Azad Hind Fauj. It was day of humiliation for India.

(A.S. Noorani 2.5.2014 Frontline partition truth, Sucheta Mahajan Oxford University Press, Mountbatten Auto-Biography).

Teesta Sheetal vad writes that fine attempts were made on Gandhi's life.

- A. First attempt June 1934—Pune Bomb blast. It failed due to lack of planning and co-ordination.
- B. Second Attempt : 1 July 1944 Nathu Ram attacks in Panchgeni Nathuram was caught and disarmed.
- C. Third Attempt : 1944 at Sevagram Nathuram was involved.
- D. Fourth Attempt : June 1946 Train sabotaged en route to Pune. Gandhi escaped from the jaws of death and boasted "I am to live till the age of 125".
- E. Fifth Attempt : January 20, 1948 Madan Lal explodes a bomb at New Delhi.
- F. Sixth Attempt : 30 Jan, 1948
Nathuram killed Gandhi successfully.
He was a fanatic supporter of Savarkar

Hindu Maha Sabha celebrated the murder Gandhi who had bowed the seeds of partition by accepting separate electorate and by involving in Khilafat Movement. Savarkar was blamed for the murder of Gandhi. Preneonsly Savarkar was also namen and blamed and credited by his role in murder of Rand, Jackson and colonel wnly. After inopala riot in Kerla has switched ours from militant mationalisan to communalism. On his got prepare Hedgewar for forming R.S.S. The Bretta Italian by which Gandhi was killed was handedover by king Sindhia to Savarkar. Savarkar to Nathuran to accomotion the murder.

PARTITION

On 18 April, the Viceroy told Jinnah "if India must be partitioned, so must Bengal and Punjab." Jinnah was distressed on first April. Gandhi put forward a plan which he had aired from time to time in the past that:

Jinnah be invited to form an interim central government. Congress should be prepared to accept government by the Muslim League if by so doing they could ensure the unity of their country.

Intrigue was same as applied against Subhash in 1939*.

Congress leadership rejected it with alacrity. Mountbatten had seen in it the cleverness of Gandhi. He described the proposal undoubtedly mad. By mid-April 1947, Viceroy was sure that some sort of partition was inevitable, but what form it would take and how it would be achieved, remained obscure. Sardar Patel was the Tammany Hall boss of the Congress party: tough, unscrupulous, knowing, a pragmatist, concerned with the realities of power, indifferent to abstract theorizing. Nehru and he viewed each other with suspicion and some distaste. Mountbatten found Nehru vastly the more sympathetic but felt surer of his ground in discussion with Patel. Patel was most charming, according to Viceroy. On 8 March working committee

* Both Subhash and Jinnah wanted composite cabinet best Gandhi refused it in 1939 to Subhash and now he was proposing Jinnah to head the Govt. denying collective leadership. This was nothing but trap so it was rejected by Jinnah and Patel outright.

of Congress approved a resolution which envisaged the division of Punjab. Nehru has told Michael Brecher his biographer that:

Partition had become inevitable a year before it happened.

Partition was a defeat to be accepted with reluctance. The decision in principle was made, it remained to work out a plan which would be acceptable, in practice, to everyone concerned.

Note—Revisionist Indian historians see:

Mountbatten as a crafty diplomat who manipulated the innocent Indian politicians. Thus many Indian leaders ended up stating the impossibility of a united India without an unparalleled civil war, while Viceroy pretended himself to be completely open to the question of country's partition. Gandhi's proposal to accept Jinnah as head of government was not an innocent proposal. Gandhi was sure that after departure of Britishers, we will throw out Jinnah as we have majority in the constituent assembly. Mount batten clearly read in between the lines and Jinnah also understood the inherent meaning of the proposal. He asked Gandhi.

Mr. Gandhi! What you want Independent India, Independent Pakistan or civil war?

Gandhi's cunningness was apparently clear before Jinnah. Mountbatten discovered the truth more quickly and the proposal was shelved. Mountbatten feared that if the partition had not been made during British rule, Hindus would have never allowed partition being the majority and held the Muslims by force under subjection. Gandhi denied the charge and to Mountbatten : "It is physically impossible for millions of Muslims under subjection by force". (Front Line 2.5.2014 as above)

TRANSFER OF POWER

By the evening of 11 May a new basis for the transfer of power had been forged and Nehru and Patel had agreed that it was acceptable, in principle. We shall get what is called "Dominion Status" which is said to be more or less equivalent to independence. Mountbatten had seen on it—"the early termination of present responsibility in the field of law and order and terrific worldwide enhancement of British prestige."

Note—It was indeed an arrangement of Return of Empire in the garb of Commonwealth.

At 10 A.M. on 2 June Nehru, Patel and Kriplani for the Hindus; Jinnah, Liaqat Ali and Abdur Rab Nishtar for the Muslims; and the Sikh Baldev Singh met with the Viceroy to receive copies of the British government's statements for immediate Transfer of power. Mountbatten told them that he would expect their answer before midnight. Jinnah said that he could accept nothing without authority of the council of the All India Muslim League and that, this would take a week to assemble. Jinnah was hesitating as Pakistan offered to him was truncated.

Would Jinnah at least nod his head when Mountbatten said "that he was satisfied with the assurances he had received from Muslim League? A reluctant yes. Knowing that this time was the best he could hope for, Mountbatten decided to carry on. The leaders again met early on 3 June. The plan was accepted.

On 4 June 1947, Mountbatten devoted his energies to persuading his visitor Gandhi with a skill, persuasiveness and flair for salesmanship, that the plan should be properly called the Gandhi plan. Gandhi told in his prayer meeting,

"The Viceroy had no hand in partition. If both of us—Hindus and Muslims—cannot agree on anything else, then the viceroy is left with no choice." (Madhu Dandwate: Memoir)

Note—Gandhi told A.I.C.C. members on 14-15 June 1947 that:

Partition was tragic but inevitable, the Swami Sahajanand, Purushotam Das Tandon, Algu Rai Shastri, Shivan Lal Saxena, Mohan Lal Gautam*, Abdul Gani, Latifur Rahaman, Chouthi Ram Gidavani, Gopinath Bardolai protested; but due to betrayal of Congress socialist, Gandhi won his point and proposal was passed with clear majority. Those who were opposed to partition fought tooth and nail but in vain. They lost the battle. They were shocked.

Independence was mortgaged as status was only of dominion. The idea of total independence was sacrificed on the altar of dominion status. This suited the Indian Comprador Bourgeoisie and their constitutional representatives.

Country was divided in the best interest of colonial master.

It was victory for Gandhi but defeat of Subhash and Sahajanand and their followers who wanted sovereign independent India, Kisan Mazdoor class taking over the state power. But, this hope was belied on 15 August 1947.

MOUNTBATTEN'S EMISSARY AND ALLY

V.P. Menon, V.K. Krishna Menon, were his closest advisers and allies. V.P. Menon was close to Patel, Muhamad Ali Choudhary I.A.S. was close to Liaqat Ali, Edvina Mountbatten was close to Nehru, Patricia and Pamela Mountbatten were close to Gandhi. Thus, the circuit was complete. Mountbatten could clearly read the minds of Indian leaders through his allies and advisers. And so, the stage was set for the final act. Indian constitutional leaders only danced at the tune of Mountbatten. V.P. Menon wrote the script of partition.

* Mohan Lal Gautam was from Aligarh, Shiban Lal Saxena from Gorakhpur Chouthi Ram from Sindh and Gopinath from Assam, Algu from Azamgarh.

RADCLIFFE AWARD

Liaqat Ali wrote letter to Ismay to protest about the alleged award of Gurdaspur to east Punjab on 11 August 1947. On 9 August Nehru wrote to Mountbatten for head works of irrigation system and hills of Chitgown. As soon as Dominion Status was granted to British India, Paramountcy would come to an end and Indian states will become ulsters of India. Chieftains of native states were built up by Britishers to weaken Indian resistance to Empire. Mount batten opined:

On 15 June I arrived to Srinagar with Ismay. The message they bore was that the Maharaja should establish the will of his people and then accede to India or Pakistan according to their wishes. If the choice was for Pakistan—as surely it would be—Patel had assured Mountbatten that the Indian government would not object. The Maharaja, however, disliked the prospect of accession to Muslim Pakistan even more than to Congress India.

Radcliffe totally changed the drawing of border roughly drawn by Lord Valve. He gave Ferojpur and Pathankot to India. In lieu of it Hindu Tharparkar went to west Pakistan. He gave Mushirabdbad, west Dinajpur to Hindustan whereas Hindu Khulana and Baudh Chatgawn hill (95 per cent Budhists) went to East Pakistan. North Rangapur Went to Paskistan . Leaders of both dominions were furious but at last became quiescent. Award was announced after 15 August 1947 resulting in huge massacre.

Kanwar Sain, chief engineer of Bikaner states that Justice Munir told him “Radcliffe* has changed his mind on this issue and had done so after a conversation with Mountbatten.” He gave Sutlej head works of Forozpur to India.

* Radcliffe was Chairman of Boundary Commission in 1947.

UNION JACK

Nehru entirely agrees that there should be no let down of the Union Jack on 15 August. It was unfurled along with Tiranga on 15 August 1947, the day of independence. It was not lowered down. God save the king was sung. Oath was taken in the name of king. This was the predicament.

RELIGIOUS POLITICS

By constantly using religious symbolism in politics for decades. Gandhi in effect furthered British policies of divide and rule by alienating the muslim population of the Indian sub continent away from the national movement.

MASSACRE

Trains packed with refugees were set upon and their passengers massacred; those who fled on foot ran the gauntlet of bands of murderers. Each incident provoked a new wave of refugees, each wave of refugees generated its own crop of bloody incidents.

Ian Stephens estimates that 5 lakh lives were lost. J.P. Khosla also agrees that 4 to 5 lakh lives were lost. Property worth crores was destroyed and further crores worth uprooted.

Note—The gravest charge against Mountbatten, Gandhi and Jinnah was:

They failed to foresee the consequences of partition. By their participation and rush to independence, they created the circumstances in which such consequences became more probable. It boiled up only when the British had handed over. Pendered Moon believes that the vigour and speed with which Lord Mountbatten rated had at least the merit of confining it to the Punjab. But, fact remains that Mountbatten did not foresee the coming catastrophe.

Teesta Setalvad in his book "Beyond about" opined "It was claimed that the partition was caused by Gandhiji and he had asked to give Rs. 55 crores to Pakistan for which he was murdered. Sardar Vallabh Bhai Patel was the first person to give consent to Pakistan. Thereafter Nehru gave his approval. The Gwalior Govt. (Maharaja Sindhia) had given a cheque of Rs 6500 for purchasing pistols etc. for the murder (of Gandhi) Roal conspirators behind the murder of Gandhiji were not all punished. However, the incidents at Gwalior remained under the carpet. The reason of Rs. 5 crores is nothing but an alibi for the murder of Gandhiji. After bomb blast of 20 January police bandobast was increased to 26 for Gandhi's safety. Gandhi head intended that only Pates should resign. Vallabh Bhai Patel had informed Lord Mountbatten that he was agreeable to the partition. Gandhiji agreed because he had no alternative". (Page 139, 173, 10 abovementioned). Gandhi was clever enough not own blame of partition on his head. So, he gave all sorts of statements for public consumption only. He was for strong central and weeak province. Jinnah was for autonomons province. So, it was clash of different perception, different view point and there was no meeting point. It was of Hindu and Muslim Bourgeoisie, Bureaucrats and their class interests. Both Birla and Tata and Adam Ji wanted Partition. N.V. Gadgil Maulana Azad and others have writeen much about even Mount Batten in his autobiography has it and mention it. Partition was result not only communes but of separt different class interest also. Gandhi was representatiue of Birala after all.

THE AGRARIAN CONDITION OF SOCIETY

(Based on Walter Hauser Thesis)*

What becomes apparent is that Bihar in the thirties had a rapidly increasing population without a commensurate increase in crop production. And, in the case of rice for example, this is a static production which may even tend to a small percentage decrease. This provided a crucial backdrop to the lower crop prices and increased rents, which were also a feature of this period. It was primarily in limited areas of South Bihar that a produce rent (Bhawali System or Danabandi System). The system allowed blatant exploitation of a tenantry unprotected by practical law. A situation of discontent in which agitation could take hold existed here. It was in this region then that the atmosphere was exacerbated by the depression, fallen crop prices, which resulted in a grave price rent squeeze for those tenants who had previously commuted produce rent to cash. These were circumstances fraught with serious political consequences.

The relationship between landlord and tenant and the land system on which this relationship is based are complex questions. In Bihar the social composition of this group was predominantly Bhumihar Brahmin with smaller number of Kayasthas, Muslims, Rajputs and Brahmins in that order. The ostentations castles and dwelling places in town and country attested to their growing wealth and power.

As early as 1885, Sir Lakshmeswar Singh, the then Maharaja

* Walter Houser is scholar who wrote biography of Swamiji and presented a Thesis in Shikago University on Bihar Kisan Movement.

of Darbhanga, opposed the Bengal Tenancy Act in the old Imperial Legislature Council. Parenthetically, it might also be noted that the Maharaja at this time made an annual anonymous donation of Rs. 10,000 to the coffers of the newly established Indian National Congress. The Maharaja's younger brother, the Honourable Maharajadhiraj, Sir Rameshwar Singh became the first Indian member of the Executive Council of the new government of Bihar and Orissa in 1912, while Sir Ganesh Dutt Singh a leading spokesman for the Bhumihar Brahmin community and the landed interests was minister of Local Self-government from 1923. Rajandhari Singh (Dharahara Estate) from a prominent landed family of west Patna served as President of the Provincial Legislative Council prior to the new ministries of 1934 and Rameshwar Singh, a landlord of Sambe (Gaya) and, subsequently, prominent in the Reora dispute, served as President of the Gaya District Board for a time in the thirties. Landed aristocracy in Bihar were irregular in attendance and were not organised at all, and only few of them either wished or were able to speak in the council.

It was this landed aristocracy in Bihar that exercised overwhelming and uninhibited power in agrarian society and that became the focal point of peasant struggle in the twentieth century. There was a close identity between the tenant and the small holder and overlapping interests in all directions that creates confusion in the beginning of agitation. In fact, widespread litigation was initiated by landlords in the civil courts to defeat the object of the record of rights while its preparation was still in progress and the litigation continued after the record was published.

The image of the Kisan Sabha leaders themselves ranged from inclusion of the Petty landlord in the 1936 to the exclusion of virtually everyone but the agricultural labourer and poor peasant in 1944. These attitudes largely represented the

ideological development of the leader of Bihar Kisan Sabha, Swami Sahajanand Saraswati, through his increasing contact with communist literature and communist political workers. The earliest constitutional document of the Kisan Sabha in 1929 defined a peasant as anyone whose primary source of livelihood was agriculture, while the more elaborate constitution of the Bihar Provincial Kisan Sabha of 1936 said essentially the same thing, with a detailed exposition of fundamental rights necessary to achieve a sound livelihood by agricultural means. Sahajanand wrote as follows:

A peasant is known as a grihastha, a person who earns his livelihood by cultivation and agriculture, be, he a petty landlord, ryot, or labourer working on wages for ploughing fields.

This view indicates much of the character of the Kisan Sabha and the Swami's concept of the movement at this time. During the period of his imprisonment and association with the communists in 1941, Sahajanand did much writing and produced a number of descriptive and theoretical works dealing with the peasant problem. He argued that:

The Kisan Sabha belongs to those exploited and suffering masses whose lot is connected with cultivation and who live by it. The more they are oppressed, the nearer they are to the Kisan organization and nearer it is to them.

(Swami Sahajanand Saraswati: *Khet Mazdoor*)

Yet in 1944, when the Swami was standing alone with the communists in the All Indian Kisan Sabha he admitted that "it was really the middle and rich cultivators who were ... for the most part with the Kisan Sabha."

Then with his characteristic bluntness he stated the position as it stood in his way.

“They are using the Kisan Sabha for their benefit and gain, while we are using or rather trying to use them (middle and big cultivator) to strengthen the Sabha till the lower and the lowest strata of the peasantry are awakened to their real economic and political interests and needs and have become class conscious.”

He further stated:

It is they, the semi proletariats or the agricultural labourers who have very little land or no land at all, and the petty cultivators, who any how squeeze a most meagre living out of the land, they cultivate and eke out their existence. We are the Kisans of our thinking ... and who make and must constitute the Kisan Sabha ultimately.

(1944, 8th session of A.I.K.S. Bezwada (the present day Vijayawada in A.P.) Presidential Address, 14-15 March)

But Swami Ji found that these “actual Kisans” did not confide in the “upper strata” of society who were the leaders of the Kisan Sabha. By 1949, when he was free of the communists and the Congress, which he had rejoined earlier, Sahajanand saw a brighter day, for the rural proletariat, then constituted the majority in Kisan Sabha as he saw it, and was becoming aware of its rights, duties and responsibilities.

(Swami Sahajanand Saraswati, *Maharudra Ka Mahatandava*)

Jagiwan Ram was sponsored leaders* to curtail Swamiji and Ambedkar by Zamindars Bihar.

Jagiwan Ram in 1937 formed the Bihar Provincial Khet Mazdoor Sabha but there is no evidence to suggest that it was an organisation or movement of consequence. 1931 census put

* Jagiwan Ram was intelligent, well read able administer for able strategist , able orator and perfect coordinator. Ambedkar was veering, oscillating among Britishers Gandhi, Jinnah, but Jagiwan was steal last stable Gandhiate till his end.

rent payers as constituting 66 per cent of the agricultural population, labourers 30 per cent and non-cultivating rent receivers and owners the small balance. The tenant was also harassed by an inordinate enhancement of rents and the exactions of illegal cases, or abwabs, forced compulsory labour, or begar and actual physical maltreatment or zulum. The purpose of Khet Mazdoor Sabha was to divide the Kisan Sabha but fortunately remained on paper and proved to be fake. Swamiji incorporate Khet Mazdoor class in Kisan Sabha after 1938 and made this class vanguard of agricultural revolution.

Source—Gaya Jile ke Kisano Ki Karun Kahani collected in Swami Sahajanand Rahnavali and Wafter Hauser Thesis.

FORMATION OF THE BIHAR PROVINCIAL KISAN SABHA

The emergence of a strong peasant movement in Bihar in 1929 was basically a reaction to the pressure of a harsh agrarian system heightened by the ill effects of economic depression. The response to these pressures took the organised form of the Bihar Provincial Kisan Sabha under the influence of unique leadership and the political ferment which characterised the decade of 1930's. The leadership was the product of Tilkaites nationalism, but, increasingly, as it became disillusioned with Gandhian concepts and methods as inadequate for achieving political and economic objectives, the leadership moved to the left, creating a class-oriented peasant movement since 1934.

The character of the movement was determined by its leadership and by the organisation or modus operandi designed to express the ideology and, more specifically, the progress it formulated in relation to the agrarian and political issues of the day. The nature of the movement changed with the varying character of the issues it faced and with the predilections of its dominant leader. First organisation was West Patna Kisan Sabha formed in 1927-28 by Swami Ji. The Bihar Provincial Kisan Sabha was first organised late in 1929 in a meeting at the Sonepur Malain Suran district. It was reorganised in 1933 and it emerged as a class-oriented movement with the participation of the Congress Socialist Party from 1934. Nationally, the Congress had been reluctant to press for a no tax campaign lest such a campaign should induce conflict between the

landlords and their tenants in the Zamindari regions of the country. Gandhi wrote in his book "Hind Swaraj":

It is not contemplated that at any stage of non co-operation, we would seek to deprive the zamindars of their rent. The Kisan Movement must be confined to the improvement of the status of the Kisans and the betterment of the relations between the zamindars and them.

(Also, *Young India*, May 18, 1921, "The Zamindars and the Ryots")

Sahajanand in his biography observed:

The Satyagraha of 1930 brought unprecedented awakening among the Kisans. The result was that their problems also came to the fore front. They had sacrificed their utmost at the behest of the Congress. How could these Congress leaders neglect them when they had to utilise the Kisans in the coming freedom struggle.

Nehru who was the foremost spokesman of the socialist element in the Congress drew the lines very clearly in discussing the issue. These developments demonstrated two things:

1. First, the joining of the economic with the political elements of the nationalism and the consequent emphasis of nationalism in India on the agrarian problem.
2. Secondly, the increasing division between the socialist elements of the Congress and the more conservative primary leadership hinging on the very question of agrarian change.

The growing split between the left and right elements of the Congress which the agrarian problem delineated so sharply was broadened by the fear harboured by the left that the vested

interests sought to stifle agrarian change by opposing political change or accepting only moderate change Limited to petty welfare.

In Bihar, the Congress leaders did not press for the rent and revenue remissions. Rent reduction (movement) did temper the prospect for peasant risings and agrarian upheaval in the affected districts. The dominant position in the Bihar Congress was that of the political right, reluctant to introduce the social issues and class issues. Under the circumstances, the peasants of Bihar had faint hope of ameliorating his immediate condition. Both the government and the Congress exhibited an implicit confidence in the trusteeship of the zamindar over his tenants. These approaches of Congress and government insular class oriented response to the peasant problem. The beginnings of such a class-oriented peasant movement were apparent in Gaya in the late month of 1931 under the leadership of Yadunandan Sharma.

Sahajanand had entered Congress politics and under the Gandhian influence and felt dedicated to Gandhi's principles, but his civil disobedience imprisonment in 1930 confirmed the Swami's belief that the Gandhi's stress on the observance of jail rules and discipline was a complete farce in practice. Sahajanand was, therefore, disillusioned with the Congress and its leadership and moving closer to a specific identity with peasant interests. His separation from Gandhi was to come later in 1934 on a more fundamental ideological issue. But, his disenchantment—first with Congressmen and then with Gandhi was the personal and ideological preludes to Sahajanand's identification with the C.S.P. and then with the communists (including Forward Block). The constant pressure was his emotional involvement with the condition of the peasants around him. Sahajanand again entered the political life of Bihar as the leading exponent of peasant interests.

Throughout 1933, Sahajanand campaigned actively against any

compromise measure conceived in the interests of the zamindars and the united party. Awadheshwar Prasad Sinha describes:

Swami Ji alone led the whole struggle and addressed hundreds of meetings at different places of the Province.

In any case, Sahajanand moved far and wide through the province in opposition to hostile legislation and his success in these efforts was generally recognised. Rajendra Prasad commented on these efforts—(autobiography)

Swami Sahajanand put a new lease of life into the old Kisan Sabha and organized an opposition to the tenancy bill. His campaign was so successful that the amendment bill was further amended and passed to the advantage of Kisans.

The major socialist leaders of Bihar (including Jayaprakash, Benipuri, Ram Nandan Mishra, Kishori Prasan Singh, Basawan Singh, Ganga Saran Singh, Karyanand Sharma, Rahul Sanskritayan and others) joined Swami Sahajanand in Bihar Provincial Kisan Sabha. During the succeeding two years, the organisation became an influential movement in Bihar. Its character was determined by its leadership, its organisation and method of operation; and by ideology and programme, it formulated in relation to the agrarian and political issues of the day. In 1929, leadership was composed of Ram Dayalu Singh, Yamuna Karjee, Shrikrishna Singh and Gursahay Lal alongwith foremost leader Swami Sahajanand. In 1933, Yadunandan Sharma, Karyanand Sharma, Yamuna Kajjee were chief associates of Swami Sahajanand. In 1936, Chief associates of Swami Sahajanand were Yadunandan Sharma, Karyanand Sharma, Yamuna Karjee, Jaiprakash, Ram Nandan Mishra, Rambriksh Benipuri, Suraj Narayan Singh, Panchanan Sharma, Sheel Bhadra Yajee and Rahul Sankritayan.

CHARACTER OF THE MOVEMENT

Swami Sahajanand who was already moving away from a position of agrarian compromise, was confirmed in that view through 1934-35 and by 1936 the programme of the Kisan Sabha was formulated in a manifesto couched in terms of clear class demands. The nature of these demands, and the manner of their presentation by the Swami, determined the essential character of the movement in these years. With the success of the Congress in 1937 election achieved with the support of the Kisan Sabha and its acceptance of office by Congress in July of that year, the differences between the hopes and demands of the Kisan Sabha on the one hand, and the programme of the Congress on the other, came into clear focus and subsequent conflict. These elements of development and conflict moulded the Kisan Sabha in the time of its greatest strength through the middle and late years of thirties. Congress socialist had officially joined the movement in 1934. This influenced the Kisan Sabha. New cadres joined it and they were helpful in propagation of Kisan Sabha.

LEADERSHIP

The development of political leadership in modern Bihar resulted from the movement for provincial separation from Bengal and the Gandhian nationalism of Champaran and non-co-operation. The movement for separation from Bengal led by Sachchidanand Sinha and other educated Biharis, provided a sense of political cohesion, which found expression through

such journals as *Kayastha Samachar*, *Hindustan Review*, *Bihar Times* initiated in 1894.

Decidedly more important, however, to the appearance of nationalist leadership was Gandhi's Satyagraha against the indigo planters and on behalf of the peasants in Champaran in 1917. It attracted young lawyers to the political service of the country. But it was only a matter of time until other groups would emerge such as smaller landed gentry who joined its nationalist politicians and its new ruling class. Much to the distress of the British, this gentry was joined by the political adventurer, the half educated product of high schools and colleges. By 1930, the official position accepted the fact that the "gentry" and the "adventurer" the nationalist opposition, were the most active in promoting the political education of the masses. Their only mistake came in failing to recognise that the new nationalist political personality was not a temporary phenomenon as they had hoped. The gentry and adventurer were the major source of political leadership throughout the nationalist period in the case of Congressmen, socialists, communists and the Kisan Sabhites alike.

In the Kisan Sabha, this leadership rested in the hands of men like Yadunandan Sharma, Ram Chandra Sharma, Ramnandan Mishra, Ram Briksh Benipuri, Ganga Saran Sinha, Awadheshwar Prasad Singh, Jayaprakash Narayan, Shyam Nandan Singh, Karyanand Sharma and Kishori Prasan Singh. The few exception, and the one that proved the dedication and commitment was Swami Sahajanand Saraswati and his trusted associates. The group was divided between those who were Kisan Sabhites or Swami-ites; following the personal leadership of Sahajanand with no party affiliation and other were Congress socialists.

Note—Yadunandan Sharma and Ramchander Sharma were Swami-ites, rest were affiliated to C.S.P., C.P.I. or Forward

Block. Dhanraj Sharma, Sheel Bhadra Yaji were Forward Blockists. Rahul and Kishori Prasan Singh, Karyanand were with C.P.I. However, Yadunandan Sharma, Kishori Prasan Singh, Rahul Sankritayan, Karyanand Sharma remained committed to the cause till end. Socialists who were followers of Jay Prakash wavered and left Kisan Sabha in 1941.

Economically, the Kisan Sabha leaders were primarily from landholdings families. In some cases of considerable means, more generally of moderate holdings, and in few cases from small holding families. An occasional professional person, lawyer or doctor with landholding connections was found among the leadership group in the Kisan Sabha.

Kishori Prasan Singh, Karyanand Sharma belonged to poor family whereas Rahul was Sanyasi, Durga Paswan was the first martyr of Kisan Sabha who was hanged in 1938. After Independence, Shakti Paswan was murdered by Zamindars. Yogendra Shukla was sent to Kalapani. Naxshtra Malakar was kept in Jail in colonial India as well as independent India. He as well as Ranganath Brahmchari of Sanda (Tekari) became rebel and taught suitable lesson to Zamindars who were oppressive. This irritated the congress ministry and they were put in Jail. Karpoori Thakur who started his political career under Ram Nandan Mishra and Swami Sahajanand became Chief Minister of Bihar in due course. Character of the movement changed with changing situation and changing class orientation of its cadre. In the beginning congress leaders were in dominance next came the turn of congress socialists. In the last only Forward Blockists and communists remained with Swamiji for a long period. Swamiji association with Forward Block was broken in 1942 but in 1948 both came together. Swamiji became head of united socialist organization of India on 21 Feb. 1950 whose main stem was Forward Block. Communists left Swamiji in 1945 came near to him in 1947 and had broken in 1948.

IDEOLOGICAL POSITIONS of C.S.P and A.I.K.S.

Ideologically, the leadership of the Kisan Sabha in Bihar was characterised by the changing attitude of Swami Sahajanand towards the agrarian problem and the political circumstances of the thirties.

- Prior to 1934, this was purely a consideration of the improvement of agrarian conditions by efforts of compromise.
- (After 1936) There was a shift to a recognition of the social implications of the problem and its relationship to the political considerations.
- To the important degree which this involved the ideological attitudes of the Congress socialists there was an indecisive mixture of Marxian and Fabian socialist ideas, tempered by the influence of Gandhism.
- While non-violence was described as a policy and not a creed the appeal to violence was seldom direct.
- On the other hand, at the point of political departure between Sahajanand and socialists beginning in 1939, the issue involved a matter of support of the militant nationalism of Subhash Chandra Bose (Swami supported Subhash whereas C.S.P. supported Gandhi, Nehru combine).
- From that position Sahajanand moved into the theoretical morass of Marx, Lenin and Stalin, which he

encountered in his 1940 imprisonment.

- The shift of Bihar's primary peasant leader from a practical concern with agrarian problems to a theoretical economic and political position which placed him at odds with nationalism itself was a decisive factor in his political dissent and decline of the movement he had created.
- Sahajanand constantly and persistently pressed upon the peasants, the need for organization to cope with the injustice, they faced; but he spoke more of the organization of mass action than of constitutional formalities.

(Note— Sahajanand's world-view was entirely different from that of Gandhi who thought that constitutional action is enough. Sahajanand laid emphasis on class struggle as main form of struggle)

- The shift from compromise to class consciousness had been achieved and a new ideological framework had been supplied for the peasant struggle and its leaders.
- But, if Sahajanand was influenced in the analysis of the agrarian problem of Bihar by the socialists and Marxists he maintained at all times the singleness of purpose which had impelled him from the beginning, and this was the resolution of peasant distress.
- Swami Sahajanand spoke at Kisan Sabha meeting held at Goraul Bazar, on August 24, 1934.

"I do not worship God, but the kisans, who were poor and the real creature of God and who deserved all help and service."

The demands and requirements of the peasant as enunciated in the manifesto were, however, incompatible with the policy and character of the Congress and they became the

substance of conflict when the Congress assumed office in 1937. The issues of conflict were the tenancy legislation of the ministry and the manner by which its legislation was effected. The criticism of these issues by the Kisan Sabha, and its agitations against continuing agrarian distress formed the other elements of controversy. The social base of Congress as comprador Bourgeoisie, Zamindars, urban elites and Rich peasants whereas social base of Kisan Sabha was Khet Mazdoor, poor peasant proletariat and other poors. Class interest were different, world view were different, Aim and method were different. Swamiji was for total complete independence through class war and for Kisan-Mazdoor Raj. Congress aim was for dominion status through compromise. Congress socialists were second line of defence of Indian Bourgeoisie, so, their role was limited. They were not in favour of Kisan Mazdoor Raj. They were in Kisan movement in the interest of Indian Bourgeoisie. Indian Bourgeoisie wanted to abolish zamindari for two purposes: one to diminish zamindars dominance on Govt. and other to force him to invest their capital in market. For this purpose they supported Nehru, Jay Prakash, Lohia, Minoo Masani openly. Jayprakash was on pay role of Birla, Minoo Masani was partenr of Tata, Lohia was director of Chanpatia Sugar Mill of Birla, Lohia was financed by Badrivilash Piti, Iamna Lal Bajaj, J.P. was financed by Ganesh Dutt and Rana of Nepal (Collected works of Lohia, Benipuri ke Sansmaran).

Sahajanand was nearer to Marx. He was not classical Marxist or orthodox Marxist. He was always in favour of mass struggle rather than Armed struggle rather than Armed struggle. He was always in favour of mass organization rather than dictatorship of a coterie. He was in favour of combined leadership of labour peasant and petty Bourgeoisie. He disliked single class leadership. In his opinion peasant was equal partner

of impeding revolution. He was a little bit nationalistic inspite of his Marxism. For class struggle he was nearer to communists for nationalism and mass culture he was nearer to Subhash. This was his predicament which remained till last.

ORGANIZATION AND METHOD

While the Kisan Sabha has a formal organizational structure, it is more accurately characterised as a movement than organisation as such. Its primary instruments of operation were numerous meetings, and the rallies, struggles, and annual sessions of district and provincial Kisan Sabhas which succeeded in creating, and, more importantly, in expressing an awareness of the agrarian problems in the province among its peasants. These means were also the methods of agitation which exerted pressure for change. An important Bihar Socialist Kisan Sabha leader has argued that it was the agitation and struggles that made a popular mass following, and not organisation. A divisional commissioner of Bhagalpur noted on December 2, 1935 that the "Kisan Sabha touches the ryot more directly, its meetings are larger than the Congress."

Sahajanand constantly and persistently pressed upon the peasants, the need for organisation, to cope with, the injustice, they faced; but he spoke more of the organisation of mass action than of constitutional formalities. The membership of the Bihar Provincial Kisan Sabha was estimated at 80,000 in 1935, and the figure for 1938 was placed at upwards of 2,50,000 which made it by far the largest such provincial body in India. At the height of the agitation, Sahajanand consistently addressed local village meetings of upto 5,000 peasants, and the estimates of peasant rallies in Patna were commonly as high as 100,000. With the formation of the All Indian Kisan Sabha at Lucknow in April 1936, (presided by Swami Ji) Sahajanand once involved, extended

total support, and to a large extent created and supported the organisational framework by his own efforts, the A.I.K.S. suffered insufficient local depth to sustain a national movement.

DANDA CULT

To the Congress, as a government in power, rallies and agitations took on the aspect of the mob and bordered on incitement to violence (Mahadev Desai Article). At the time of his resignation from the working committee in January 1938, Sahajanand denied the charge of violence made against him, but he did claim the right of self-defence with the danda or lathi for the peasant.

The tension between the Congress and the Kisan Sabha continued when Sardar Patel questioned the right of peasants to form class organisations at all, and Gandhi suggested that the Kisan Sabhites who sought to win majorities in Congress committees were bound to win opposition to their activities. Gandhi is said to have told them in A.I.C.C. meeting in September 1939, to leave the Congress. Sahajanand could not and did not accept the resolution, obviously directed at Bihar Kisan Sabha, charged some Congressmen with violence, arson and murder and asked the Congress committees to take action against them while assuring zamindars, writer's note) that the Congress was ready to protect their person and property. The differences were practically reflected in the militant agitation of the Sabha and the restrictive measures of the Congress. Sahajanand had already started the move to keep away from the socialists nationally, and this was to result in the split of the Bihar Kisan movement during Sahajanand's imprisonment in 1941. Gandhiaites had expelled Sahajanand from congress in 1939 for six years on charge of organizing peasants without approval of provincial congress which was treated as an act of indiscipline. Subhas too was expelled for three years on the same charge in 1939.

NATIONAL POLITICS AND THE DECLINE OF THE BIHAR KISAN SABHA: WALTER HAUSER

Whereas before 1939, the Kisan Sabha could argue convincingly that its objective was bread, the politics the means; thereafter, it was more difficult to do so with the growing threat of war and increasing concern of all political groups in India with the relationship of nationalism to that conflict. Swami Sahajanand was no exception to this concern. In the process he came to devote himself increasingly to national political questions and what is more important, the views he adopted separated him not only from the Congress, but also from the Congress socialists and, ultimately, with the communists, set him apart from the peasants of Bihar themselves. While, in the ultimate analysis, he recognised his folly, his state of vacillation to judgement and action, cost him dearly his leadership and further resulted in the collapse of the very movement he had founded. The events involved in the process hinged largely on question of national policy.

The socialists supported the official Gandhian position both at Tripuri* and subsequently at Ramgarh, when Subhash Chandra Bose escaped from India in 1941 to conspire with the Axis (power); and when the Russian entry into the war on the Allied (power) side changed the nature of that war for Sahajanand and the communists, the Swami was functioning jointly with the Forward Block and the C.P.I. Unfortunately the position he took

* Tripuri is near Jabalpur and Ramgarh is in between Hazaribagh and Ranchi.

in 1939, alienated him from both the Congress and the Congress Socialist Party, in his anxiety for action.

Sahajanand wrote in his autobiography:

My experience during these years has convinced me that the communists are more prompt and interested in the welfare of the kisans than the socialists. I have admonished my socialist friends for their lethargic behaviour.

Having thus separated himself from the C.S.P., Sahajanand found shortlived hope in his alignment with Bose in the Forward Block. To reiterate he had confidence in Bose's leadership and the Block as the instruments of united action. In a letter to Joshi*, written in 1939 he described his position:

We cannot do without some such Block or platform. The more I think over it, the more I become convinced that some such thing is essential if we want to achieve our objective. I had a long talk with J.P. in the presence of com. Gautam (Mohan Lal) at Calcutta and he could not convince me against this Block. If we still hesitate in this most timely opportune and wise move and fail to support Mr. Bose, the future of the country is doomed, at least for some time. I am confident, may the future generation will rightly curse us for losing the golden opportunity which has presented itself to us through the instrumentality of Subhash. It really pains me beyond measure when the responsible left leaders instead of thanking Subhash accuse him and impute all sorts of motives.

These hopes were given concrete form in mid-March 1940 (19-20 March)* when Subhash and the Swami organised an anti-

* P.C. Joshi was General Secretary of Communist Party of India.

* Somnath Lahiri of C.P.I. supported Sahajanand-Subhash in Ramgarh in 1940 and Sahajanand in 1948 in his endeavour for left unity. He attended Patna Conference.

compromise conference to be held in competition with the Ramgarh Congress in Bihar (Jharkhand now). Bose served as president, Sahajanand as chairman of the reception committee conference made the call of struggle, for national freedom, opposed compromise, and giving of assistance in the war or associating with the imperialist forces. There was a clear call for action. Sahajanand proclaimed in his welcome address:

There is no time to lose and we, while vigilant enough to detect and check in time every retrograde move should take the risk of an immediate plunge for direct action. Then and then alone we shall be able to save the nation from an ignoble surrender capitulation.

The Congress Socialist Party supported the official policy against this view at Ramgarh. Sahajanand was arrested in mid-April (19 April 1940). The decisive split of the Bihar Provincial Kisan Sabha occurred at the Dumraon Session in March 1941. Forward Block described Swami as leader of the progressive forces, whereas socialist, on the other hand, became followers of orthodox Gandhian leadership and attacked Sahajanand, in an attempt to make the Kisan Sabha the congress but failed.

In prison, Sahajanand had come increasingly into close contact with the young communists. Their youthful vigour and intellectual alertness attracted him. His fatal mistake, however, was support of the communist position on the question of the "people's war"*. He was released in March 1942.

He stayed on with the communists in All India Kisan Sabha from 1943, even when he became disenchanted with their policies and in 1945 he enlisted them to seek new political alignment. He was ideologue, formulator and activist of Kisan

* When Germany attacked Russia M.N. Roy, Swami Sahajanand, Indu Lal Yagnik and C.P.I. came to conclusion that nature of war has changed and now it is an 'People's war'.

movement of India. In the fag-end of his life, he had misjudged the sentiments of the peasants of India, and specifically Bihar. When he was attracted to ideological politics of the semi-nationalist left, he and the movement he had created found no support among the peasants of Bihar. (Hauser)

Note—(Vinay Bhushan Chaudhry contradicts Hauser's conclusion. All India Kisan Sabha membership increasingly rose during 1942-48. Tebhaga, Berli, Telangana struggles were fought under the red flag of All India Kisan Sabha.)

Tarachand writes – History of the freedom movement, page 517:

Mountbatten gave the amazing assurance and promise when atmosphere then prevailing was to lead to bloodshed on a large scale:

I shall see to it that there is no bloodshed and riot I will order the Army and the Air force to act. I shall use tanks and aeroplanes to suppress anybody who wants to create trouble.

Tarachand further writes P. 517

The way to hell is paved with good intentions. The good intentions of Mountbatten were completely divorced from reality, for they had slightest effect on the virtulent and inhuman developments of the times. The promise which he made out of our confidence and lack of judgement proved utterly futile.

He further writes.

On July 22, it was decided to establish a Punjab boundary force to maintain law and order under operational command of general Rees and the supreme command of general Auchinleck with about 55,000 men and officers.

Mosley commented post.

If there was confidence misplaced, this was the occasion. Rarely had a military force of such strength worked so hard to fight on so bravely to achieve so little.

It is to be noted that fifty five thousands Indian Army personnel were posted in Punjab but due to wrong policy of Govt it could not succeed to comb at and check riot. It was not their failure, it was failure of Govt. who was divided and one section wants transfer of population by means of riot (Raj Mohan Gandhi : Surdar Patel)

Riot continued unabated. Swami Sahajanand had written in fortnightly "Hunkar" when he castigated the League as representing the feudal classes. Here is the analysis of the muslim members returned to the council in 1937.

Nawabs, Rajas and Zamindars	-	21 Nos.
Khan Bahadurs	-	12 Nos.
Advocate (mostly zamindars)	-	23 Nos.
Others	only	<u>10</u> Nos.
		66

It is true both Jinnah and Gandhi had achieved the Dominion status. Kisans and mazdoors were left out and were bewildered when 15 August 1947 came with division, rape, loot and murder and displacement. The 15 August became the day of execution of total independence as viewed by Sahajanand.

Swami Sahajanand has noted that had communist party not indulged in assisting British in his war and "grow more food campaign" and instead had worked on Kisan struggles in expanding it supported by militia to protect its activities on class basis, the leaders of Muslim League would have left the politics as they were Zamindar and of elite class. Only class based peasant struggle could have made differentiation in

Muslim community and could have thrown the partition, with support of militia even Kisan Mazdoor Raj could have been established but most C.P.I leaders were in support of Gandhi-Nehru on this wrong theorization of national bourgeoisie, national front, national leader, national alliance. They became satellite of Gandhi-Nehru politics. The failure of Sahajanand was not due to ideology of Sahajanand but switch over of C.P.I. and it was C.P.I. and C.S.P. who discarded the line of united left front of Sahajanand. Andre Roberts in his book writes. "Lord Mountbatten was solely responsible for 1946-47 genocide. An impeachment proceedings ought to have been initiated against him. India was to be given freedom up to 3 June 1948. But Lord Mountbatten changed the time table after rebellion and hurriedly partitioned the country. Cyril Rad Cliffe carried out partition work hurriedly and completed with in forty days, This haste proved to be blunder. Another great blunder committed by Mountbatten was that the decision about the Indo-Pak borders was withheld and declared after the transfer of power. Had he declared the decision immediately after the demarcation then the exchange of populations would have taken place under the supervision of British military officers. They would have carried out while power was still in their hands. Mountbatten did not take requisite precaution". Gandhi-Nehru leadership supported Mountbatten in his folly actions and C.P.I.-C.S.P. followed suit. Nehru-Patel pleaded with Viceroy to take over the Govt. and run the country. Mount Batten remained in India even after 15.8.1947 as first vice roy of independent India and head of defence council. The partition of India was a consequence of calculation gone wrong on the part of both the congress and league. The partition must surely rank among the ten greatest tragedies in human history where main architect was Gandhi who was alleged to be a trained British secret Service Agent.

ARVIND NARAYAN DAS ON SAHAJANAND

Agrarian Unrest Myth of Champaran Satyagraha

The first of the series of new agrarian movement in Bihar was the celebrated Champaran Satyagraha of 1917 under a modern leader Gandhi and assisted by Raj Kumar Shukla a money-lender, Khendar Rai a zamindar and a small team of undifferentiated Bihari Vakil Zamindars such as Rajendra Prasad, Braj Kishore Prasad who all were peasant elites. The movement had limitations and remained continued to agitation.

- The prices of food grains had been rising continuously during past fifty years.
- As for sugarcane, its profitability was also higher than that of indigo especially since the First World War.
- The opening of the Tribeni Canal System in 1909 had brought as much as 3,06,800 acres of land under regular irrigation.
- The indigo cultivation was on the verge of extinction due to the invention of a cheaper artificial (synthetic) dye. (In 1912). The movement lacked continuity.
- There were other deeper agrarian issues, the movement did not even touch their fringes.
- Middle and lower peasants did not take initiative in agrarian unrest, only handful of peasant elite provided the local leadership.
- The pro-properties stand as well as the quasi—messianic

image made Gandhi an acceptable leader to the disgruntled elements in the region who were willing to rebel though only upto a point. Babu Braj Kishore Prasad who took the initiative in bringing Gandhi to Champaran was a zamindar who later on opposed the formation of the Kisan Sabha in Bihar.

- Indigo cultivation did more or less due to the invention of cheaper artificial dye in 1912.
- Out of the 15 teachers of Gandhi Ashram, 11 were from outside Bihar. School was closed very soon due to absence of local initiative.
- For the concrete work of Gandhi for the rural poor, Dhanagre finds it an equally small achievement.
- The movement neither ended nor indeed aimed at ending exploitation. It was merely symptomatic of change over from one kind of exploitation of the peasantry to another.
- The people in Champaran explain through their folk saying

“Nilhe Gaya, Milhe Aaye”

It means the planters have gone and in their place have come the sugar mill owners. (along with Gandhi)

(Ram Nandan Mishra, Kisan Ki Samasyayen, Darbhanga 1952)

BEGINNING OF KISAN SABHA

In the social scale, although the Bhumihars are known to be Brahmins, they were not given the ritual status of Brahmins, because they were cultivators. There is great differentiation within the Bhumihar Brahmin ranging from landlord to tenantry. The split in Bhumihar Mahasabha came in 1925-26 between the moderates led by Sir Ganesh Dutt and extremists

led by Sahajanand. The split was roughly on the lines of rich Bhumihar and others. Sahajanand decided to throw his lot with non-landlord section. This gave a peasant content to what had initially started as a socio-religio-cultural movement. With efflux of time the Sitaram Ashram at Bihta became the focal point of peasant movement. When the landlords raised the question how a sanyasi was taking part in the temporal problems of the poor, Sahajanand quoted the scriptures of Bhagawat Puran at them in which Prahalad answers the Narsingh.

Yogi Mendicants are selfish and living away from society, try for their own salvation without caring for others. I cannot do that. I do not want my own salvation, apart from that of many destitutes; I will stay with them, live with them and die with them.

ORIGINS OF THE KISAN SABHA

By the end of the second decade of the twentieth century, tenants among the peasantry in Bihar were not only getting more and more aware of their right on land but were also increasingly getting involved in the broad national anti-colonial struggle. By the second half of 1927, Swami Sahajanand Saraswati had fairly well established and the Shri Sitaram Ashram at Bihar. The Ashram had become a focal point of Congress activities in the region. It was from this base that the Kisan Sabha grew up. The West Patna Kisan Sabha was informally setup in the last month of 1927 but was given its formal shape on 4 March 1928. It was decided to form the Bihar Provincial Kisan Sabha at the annual gathering of peasants during Sonepur fair in 1929.

While Braj Kishore Prasad saw the danger in the Kisan Sabha and opposed it, his illustrious son-in-law Jaya Prakash Narayan with his comrades also opposed the formation of the

Kisan Sabha. The chief spokesman of this group was Ram Briksh Benipuri who also opposed vehemently the formation of Kisan Sabha on the principal plea that it would weaken the Congress and become a rival of it. This group felt that majority of Congressmen were peasants. Hence, Congress itself is the real Kisan Sabha. This group later on changed its attitude and joined the Kisan Sabha.

Sardar Patel also changed the volte face later on and was opposed to Kisan Sabha. Sporadic unorganised discontent among the peasants turned into a formidable mass movement. There were innumerable local activists but some of the more important ones among them were Jamuna Karjee, Yadunandan Sharma, Karyanand Sharma, Dhanraj Sharma, Sheel Bhadra Yjvee, Rahul Sanskritayan, Nagarjun, Jaya Parkash Narayan, Ram Briksh Benipuri, Ganga Sharan Singh, Ram Nandan Mishra, Awadeshwar Prasad Sinha etc. the organisation basically remained centered round Swami Sahajanand Saraswati.

LEADERSHIP AND ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE

The foremost of the leaders of the peasantry in Bihar was, of course, Swami Sahajanand Saraswati. He was born in 1889 in Deba village in Ghazipur district of eastern U.P. His class base was lower middle class. He opined on theism atheism quarrel:

Religion and God must be opposed because they are obstruction in way of material progress and class struggle.
(Sahajanand's Gita Hridaya)

However, before Sahajanand came to this stage, he had to traverse a long distance. Such was Swami Sahajanand Saraswati, the charismatic sanyasi rebel who laid the foundations of Kisan organisation in Bihar, built it up into a massive movement, spread it to other parts of India and radicalised it to such an extent that what had started off as a move to bring about reform

in the zamindari system, ended up destroying the system itself. Sahajanand passed away on 26 June 1950. He was a powerful speaker using the language of kisans. The cry of "Dand Hamara Zindabad" became the watchword of the Bihar peasant movement.

While Sahajanand died before the end of the first phase of the peasant movement in Bihar and Yadu Nandan Sharma was rendered reluctant by the completion of the first phase, another leader of the Kisan Sabha was able to continue the peasant movement even after the abolition of zamindari and continued to remain a powerful figure in the politics of Bihar till the 1960's. He was Karyanand Sharma. He was born in 1902 in a poor tenant Bhumihar Brahmin family.

Rahul had a curious chequered life, changing not only his area of activity but even his name several times. His constant wandering, however did not diverse Rahul from the socio-political realities of his own people and he kept involving himself in active politics in India. Rahul joined Kisan Sabha enthusiastically and took part in various agitations. Most notable was Ambari in 1939 alongwith his comrades Nagarjun, Jalil (Ram Briksh Brahmachari, too).

While Sahajanand once involved, extended total support and, to a large extent, created and maintained the organisational framework by his own efforts, the All India Kisan Sabha suffered from the very shortcomings, he had indicated; there was insufficient local depth to sustain a national movement (N. Mitra, Indian Annual Register, July-December 1937, Vol. II, Calcutta, 1938, pp. 387-389).

IDEOLOGICAL AND PROGRAMMATIC SHIFT

There were many other aspects of the great Depression when it came in 1929, causing a catastrophic fall in prices of agricultural produce which began in October and was so rapid

that grain was selling in December at two-thirds of the price.

The problems caused by the great economic depression were compounded by some other factors also.

- Flood was the perennial problem of North Bihar wiped out crops in 1934-35.
- Much more serious was the greatest earthquake of 1934.
- In the following year 1935-36, there was a drought; hence, another crop failure.
- Due to depression, agriculture wages were also depressed.
- Due to depression hit industrial and plantation sector, the demand of Bihari labour became low.
- Illegal exactions were farely common.

All these caused tremendous hardship to the rural population. Thus proved to be sure grounds for breeding agrarian unrest.

Right from the beginning Sahajanand and his associates not only made extensive lecturing tours which tended to increase the political consciousness of the tenants.

In 1936 Sahajanand defined Kisan as:

A peasant is known as a grihastha, a person who earns his livelihood by cultivation and agriculture, to be a petty landlord, ryot or the labourer working for the wages for ploughing field.

In 1941 he wrote :

The Kisan Sabha belongs to those exploited and suffering masses whose lot is connected with cultivation and who live by it. The more they are oppressed and distressed the nearer they are to the Kisan Sabha and the nearer it is to them. (Khet Mazdoor, Sahajanand)

LAST PHASE

Sahajanand remained the most radical peasants leader in Bihar. When after independence, the socialists were getting lost in the morass of ideological pretensions and incompetent actions through the setting up of such splittist organisations as the "Hind Kisan Panchayat", Sahajanand just before his death, pointed the direction of the future peasant movement by forming an All Indian United Kisan Sabha whose fundamental demand was the nationalisation of land and waterways and all sources of energy and wealth.

Immediate demands of All India United Kisan Sabha was:

For acquisition of land from those who possess vast domains and distributing them on reasonable basis among landless labourers or holders of very small plots.

(1949, Programme and Charters of Demand by Sahajanand and Algu Rai Shastri's Pamphlet.)

He made prophetic statement in 1949:

The rural proletariat is becoming aware of its rights, duties and responsibilities....when it becomes fully aware, there will be the final dance of destruction "tandava" and then the present inequitous agrarian system will start crumbling.

(Sahajanand: *Maha Rudra Ka Mahatandava*, 1949)

- The compulsions of electoral politics made it necessary for Congress to adopt a more pragmatic and down to earth agrarian programme.
- Within the Congress itself the Leftists led by J.L. Nehru, and Congress Socialist Party and even Subhash Chandra Bose acquired more importance and were able to play more decisive roles in policy formulation.
- The Congress had to face the challenge posed by Kisan Sabha which emerged as a class organisation.

In many ways, the blunt and forthright character of the Kisan Sabha's undisputed leader Swami Sahajanand Saraswati provoked conflict, and notwithstanding the attempts of the Congress national leadership to subdue this conflict, it reacted ahead in 1937-38. The Congress leaders have tended to put the blame for this impasse on the Sabhites. The facts speak for themselves otherwise.

Note—C.P.I. has no action plan of his own until 1951. Sahajanand wanted action not mere discussion. Sahajanand wanted to spread Marxism through theology based on logic and science. Sahajanand was such an Marxist who was nationalist too. He and Subhas were nearer to Marx but their framework was national. Sahajanand wanted to intensify Kisan Movement but C.P.I. was indulged in "grow more food programme" and praising Ganhdi-Nehru leadership. Opportunity was lost. Swamiji vehe mentally opposed C.P.I. line of establishing Pakistan on the pretext of self determination. Swamiji failed not due to his fault. He had supported C.P.I. on "People's War" question even at the cost of loosing popularity. But it was C.P.I. who walked out from left consolidation committee and consolidated leadership of Gandhi in India and Jinnah in Pakistani area. Failure of Swami proved to be failure of left politics in India. By writing "Kranti and Sanyukt Morcha" he put up a base paper for revolution but except Vinod Mishra and Ashok Kumar, no none from left took notice of it. C.P.I. had joined Gandhi-Nehru band wagan who fondly imagined that Pakistan would not last and would in a matter of months, seek reunion. Gandhi wrecked the last chance for preserving India's unity by selecting cabinet mission plan of may 16, 1946. Jinnah mis calculated that congress whound plead with him not to divide Indian. Gandhi did not oblige. He abetted and accepted partitions Jinnah was be wildered.

KISAN SABHA AND UNITED LEFT FRONT

COMMUNISTS

The C.P.I. elements within Kisan Sabha like Kishori Prasanna Singh and Nakshatra Malakar, were essential grassroot organisers, who had no problems working with the Sabhites on basic issues and programmes (interview with Nakshatra Malakar, Purnea 13 March 1971). As long as the better known socialists like Jaya Prakash Narayan, Ram Briksh Benipuri, Awadeshwar Prasad Sinha and others kept themselves busy with others, in either provincial level publicity or office work, there was no clash of roles. In any case, within the Kisan Sabha itself, Sahajanand stood ahead and shoulder above the others in his pre-eminence. Thus, the problem when it came was not on day to day issues but on under questions at the national political level.

CONGRESS

The major difference came on the question of relationship with the Congress, while by the end of the 1930s, it had become abundantly clear to Sahajanand that the Congress not only stood for the propertied classes but even for the protection of zamindari under various guises and that this aspect of the Congress party was most represented by Gandhi.

CONGRESS SOCIALISTS

The C.S.P. was of the view that any prospective mass movement

for freedom would only be initiated by Gandhi and his Congress (Letter of Sahajanand to "My Socialist Friends" 7 November, 1939, Shri Sitaram Ashram Bihata and Madhu Limaye Evolution of Socialist Policy, Hyderabad, 1952).

The acceptance of Gandhi as the supreme leader drove the C.S.P. into supporting his position against Subhash Bose at Tripuri and again at Ramgarh in the sessions of the Congress (N.G. Ranga, Kisans and Communists, Bombay p. 6-7). Sahajanand, on the other hand, was convinced that not only was the congress soft, there was within it, "bickering for leaves and fishes and membership of boards and legislatures and jobs" making it an organisation, in all respect, incapable of leadership of revolutionary change.

(Letter of Sahajanand to Socialists)

UNITED FRONT

Sahajanand, therefore, sought the creation of a united left which would pose an alternative to Gandhian leadership and not be subservient to it. The position he took alienated the Congress Socialist Party. The wavering attitude of C.S.P. leaders further convinced him that it would be very difficult for them to cut their umbilical cords with the Congress (Sahajanand diary, 1941 N.M.M.L. New Delhi). Notwithstanding the emerging reservation about the socialists, Sahajanand moulded them in his attempt to bring about left unity.

- The first effort at left unity was before the Tripuri Congress Session had adjourned, followed shortly by a meeting at Calcutta.
- In June 1939, Sahajanand formed a left consolidation committee with N.G. Ranga as representative of the Kisan Sabha.
- In July, the committee agreed to oppose A.I.C.C. ban

on Satyagraha action without prior consent of the respective P.C.C. The ban had been alienated against the Bakasht agitations of Bihar Kisan Sabha (Annual Register 1938 Vol. I, p. 357, Bhulabhai Desai was the mover of the resolution). Bhulabhai had made it perfectly clear that it was aimed at Kisan Sabha and particularly mentioned the Kisan activities in the Andhra and Bihar (N. Mitra Annual Register).

- The left consolidation committee again met at Calcutta with plans for “National Struggle Week” from August 31 to September 6, 1939.
- Then in October, following the outbreak of the World War, there were successive leftist attempts to organise anti-imperialist conferences, first at Nagpur and then at Lucknow. The socialists spurned the effort.

“The socialists did not participate, soon they relapsed into silence.”

(*Sahajanand Autobiography*, p. 543-548, first edition)

Sahajanand wrote in 1941:

My experiences during these years have convinced me that the communists are more prompt and interested in welfare of kisans than the socialists. I have admonished my socialist friends for their lethargic behaviour.

(Mathura Prasad Mishra, ‘Hamare Pichle Do Baras, Bihar Prantiya Kisan Sabha Ki Report’, Feb. 1940 to March 1942, p. 4)

Swami Sahajanand opposed the partition of country in the name of self determination and oppressed nationality which C.P.I. was advocating.

In jail records according to Dhanraj Sharma:

“Soon after his arrival Jaya Prakash began to carry on a subtle propaganda against Swami Ji even among us and our friends on the grounds that he was pro-communist. This betrayed a sense of frustration and the Congress Socialist Party's bitter hatred of the communists.” (B.B. Mishra, *The Indian Political Parties*, 1976, p. 467-471).

- In the All India Kisan Sabha session held at Gaya in 1939, the President Acharya Narendra Dev, a noted socialist, questioned the propriety of the red flag replacing the Congress tricolour. The Bihar Provincial Kisan Sabha has red flag with the hammer and sickle depicted on it.

The one aspect of Sahajanand that all his friends and foes agreed on, was his unquenchable thirst for actions (Interview with Nagarjun 10 Nov. 1974). He wanted radical measures in the agrarian sphere and a definite promise of independence before anything else. In the economic and social field, he had been able to create a quite stir with his Kisan Sabha but in the political sphere, all the militancy he exhibited was quietly absorbed by the huge, flabby congress organism. At Tripuri, he sympathised with Bose and included Bose and his followers in the subsequent left consolidation committee. Bose, too, found in Sahajanand a powerful ally outside Bengal and Sahajanand as an action loving found Bose as steadfast anti-imperialist leftist.

Hence, the two combined and gave a call for sounding the bugle of struggle for national freedom. Sahajanand letter to P.C. Joshi recognises the need for an organisation and he built up confidence in Bose's leadership and Forward Block as the instrument of united action. He warned that future generation might curse us for losing the golden opportunity which had presented itself to us through the instrumentality of Subhash. He wrote:

"It really pains me beyond measure when the responsible left leaders instead of thanking Subhash accuse him and impute all sorts of motive. If we still hesitate in this most timely, opportune and wise move and fail to support Bose, future generation will curse us and the future of the country is doomed at least for some time."

Official Leadership of C.P.I. and C.S.P. did not head Sahajanand.

Note:

"Sahajanand proved to be right. The defeat of Sahajanand-Subhas became the defeat of left in India. Inspite of brutal repression, Nakshatra Malakar, Yasu Nanlan Sharma and Siyaram Singh continued revolt in 1942 for many months. They were grassroot peasant leaders."

Arvind Narayan Das opined in last, concludes:

The logic of events demonstrated that an apolitical peasant movement was not possible. The once mighty and united Kisan movement in Bihar was split up by political parties.

Sahajanand became President of United Socialist Organization of India composed of 18 left parties on 21 Feb 1950. He was preceded by Saratchandra Bose and succeeded by General Mohan Singh Swamiji tenure was short as he died on 26 June 1950 all of a sudden. Partition and riots was in truth a fiasco which was made in inevitable by dangerously clever tactics of Gandhi. Jinnah in 1946 was prepared to accept a united India. The Gandhi and combine rejected the very idea of power sharing with the Muslim League. Mount Batten believed that the clever Gandhi was a disciple of Trotsky in but royal and treachery. It was pity large section of C.P.I. and C.I.P. Propagated myth of Gandhi. It was unacceptable to Sahajanand (N.G. Noorani, Front line, 2 May 2014).

MYRON WEINER ON SAHAJANAND

On Feb 21, 1950 following a prolonged illness Sarat Chandar Bose died in Calcutta. Swami Sahajanand was subsequently elected president of United Socialists Organisation. Swami Sahajanand had been the general secretary of All India Kisan Sabha (a national peasants organisation comprising 18 left parties including C.P.S. upto 1948 and without C.S.P. and M.N. Roy group) and, more recently, a member of the Forward Block. He was born in 1889, became a Sanyasi (monk) in 1907 and in 1929 formed the Kisan Sabha in Bihar alongwith some prominent Congress men. He joined Subhash Bose at the Anti-compromise conference at Ramgarh, took part in the 1942 Quit India Movement (since 1940 Ramgarh anti-compromise meeting, 19-20 March) and was a well-known advocate of left unity. Swami Sahajanand Saraswati's tenure as U.S.O.I. President was equally brief, for on June 26, 1950 he died. General Mohan Singh, of the Marxist Forward Block, was elected the new President. With two leaders lost, 1950 was a year of great personal defeat for the U.S.O.I.

But, in spite of Bose's death, renewed effort was made during that year to effect closer unity among the left forces. The U.S.O.I. general council urged the merger of trade union organisations as well as its ultra leftism and called upon the Socialist Party of India to shed its policy of reformism and sectarianism, so that all could join together in a socialist (united) front. Despite the fact that the leftist dreams of a united socialist organisation had come about, there was still a feeling among

the leftists that no true unity had been achieved. One reason is that left wing unity had always implied more than organizational unity. It had come to mean a unity and harmony of spirit at the time that spirit seemed to exist for period between 1938 and 1940 when Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose advocated an immediate middle struggle against the British and the left was united behind him.

The United Socialist Organisation of India represented at the conference included.

1. Forward Block (Both Subhashist and Marxist Section)
2. The Socialist Republican Party
3. The Bolshevik Party
4. The Revolutionary Socialist Party
5. The Revolutionary Communist Party of India
6. The Socialist Unity Centre
7. The Workers and Peasant League
8. The Revolutionary Worker's Party
9. The Desh Sebak Party (East Punjab)
10. The Bihar Kisan Sabha
11. The Workers and Peasant Party (Maharashtra)
12. The United Trade Union Congress
13. The People's Party (Madhya Pradesh)
14. Mazdoor Krishak Party (Bombay)
15. The Praja Mandal (Bangalore)
16. The I.N.A. Committee (Bengal)
17. The Bolshevik Mazdoor Party of India
18. Ram Dulari Sinha—Sugar Mill Labour Leader.

Note: C.P.I. leader Somnath Lahiri attended the Patna session of 1948 but did not attend the Calcutta meeting of 1949. The C.S.P. also did not attend any meeting.

About Jaya Prakash's attitude, about left united front Myron Weiner writes on the basis of interview with Ajit Roy Mukerjee

in Calcutta:

Shibnath Banerjee believed that:

The United Socialist Organisation would isolate the communists and that the leftist groups would be drawn closer to the socialist party since Quikar of the Forward Block, Sarat Chandra Bose and Jaya Prakash, all non-communists would dominate the front.¹ He further writes The socialists felt that it was time to built up their own party strength and not dissipate their energies in any leftist Block. Jaya Prakash felt that Sarat Chandra Bose wanted a political party whose outlook was hazy and which might eventually align itself with the communists.

The aim of U.S.O.I was:

To be a single United Socialist Party to replace Congress and bring about a socialist transformation of the country.² But, inspite of this apparent progress, the feeling of left wing unity was absent. By the end of 1950; the disintegration of the U.S.O.I. was under way...But, with the death of Swami Sahajanand, control of the U.S.O.I. fell completely into the hands of the Forward Block with General Mohan Singh as President. He co-operated with Seth Dalmia. U.S.O.I. collapsed.

Note: Myron Weiner writes about Congress Socialist Party as: "Second line of defence of Indian Bourgeoisie". Teesta Setatvad in her book *Beyond Doubt* wrote :

Jay Prakash Narayan, Ram Manohar Lohia and Kamala Devi Chatopadhyay demanded that communalist Ministers should not be kept in the cabinet. Mr Morarji Desai deposed before the Commission that he had been informed by Prof. Jain on 21 January about the plan of killing Gandhi. He

gave this information to Sardar Patel. Podell confirmed that he had also received this information through his own sources. Home Secretary Banerjee said that "There were no efforts, what soever for searching the conspirators on the basis of the information obtained from the confession on Madan Lal, which was given in the night of 20 January till the morning of 21 January. If the attempts were made then it was very easy to arrest Godse and Apte on 30 Jan. 1948. Mahatma Gandhi had told Sardar Patel at 4 in the evening, it will not be proper for both of you to be in cabinet. Gandhiji was murdered on the same day. Patel did not agree with Gandhi's opinion that the Congress be dissolved and transformed into a people's welfare organization. Gandhiji had also said that if at all the Congress had to be retained, then Jaya Prakash or Acharya Naraendre Deo should be appointed as President. Patel did not pay heed to this. Patel had not headed the suggestion of resigning from ministry. During that period there was no harmony in the relations between Gandhi and Patel. However, Mahatma Gandhi was the only person who asked Sardar Patel, when he went to Gandhiji for advice, as to why the military was not sent in Kashmir up till then even though Kashmir signed the agreement of accession after the aggression of intruders in Kashmir (Page 171, 178, 179, 178, 179, 180 Tulika Books New Delhi, 2015)

Patel resists Gandhi to pay 55 Crores rupees to Pakistan. Myron Wiener's observation should be viewed in the light of J.P.'s closeness with Birla, Goenka and Lohia's with Piti, Bajaj and others. J.P. and Lohia had abandoned the path of socialism and had become Gandhites. So Wiener depicted them as Bourgeois's representatives. It is also to be noted that non-violence and Truth were matter of convenience for Gandhi. It

was not a matter of creed and conviction for Gandhi contrarily Sahajanand and Gaffar Khan did not believe in intrigue or manauavering. World view of Ambedkar Jinnah, Savarkar and Gandhi was more or less same, inspite of different. All were propped by empire.

SHIV SAGAR SHARMA* ON SAHAJANAND

Sahajanand was product of circumstances prevailing during 1930's. He had played his role in war of independence, peasant's uprising and for establishment of Kisan Mazadoor Raj excellently and marvelously. His contribution is that he has performed extraordinarily his allotted role in his contemporary history. He was an ideologue, formulator and activist. He was the director of the play he had written. In combination with Subhash who was man of action, he might have succeeded in his endeavour for mass uprising ultimately leading to Revolution. For him, meaning of Revolution was not merely change of government or change of ruling party, or change of individual heading the government. His contemplation of Revolution was, change of ruling class by capture of power, by seizure of power with force, for fundamental and total change, abrupt change and sudden change. He was for establishing Kisan Mazdoor state power through mass involvement. Subhash and Sahajanand were complementary-supplementary to each other. He was basically Sadhu and was no match of Gandhi-Nehru's political maneuvering. It was Subhash who helped to bridge the gap. Sahajanand laid the ground work for Revolution. Now it was for Subhash to carry it out and mould it in action. However when Subhash left the field, Sahajanand became alone. Void created by absence of Subhash could not be filled up, Jaya

* Shiv Sagar Sharma is an activist and ideologue of C.P.I. M.L. Liberation. He is less academic, unorthodox Marxist, more practical and successful organizer of militant Kisan movement.

Prakash, Narendra Dev, his colleagues in the movement betrayed and went over to Gandhi-Nehru combine. Sahajanand was nor a cunning to his opponent's mateh intrigues. The defeat of Sahajanand-Subhash in India proved to be defeat of Revolution and Left politics. This was irony. However, Sahajanand gave the struggle a new language, new vigour; new edge and provided militant cadre to left movement. He continue to be a source of inspiration for several revolutionaries including Naxals. Although a section of Naxals are practising Armed Struggle discarding the lesson of Sahajanand who believed in class struggle through mass uprising. Credit goes to Late Vinod Mishra who grasped the intent of Sahajanand and adopted his mass line along with militant struggle. He emphasized his importance on both front, historical and face value, Arindam Sen and Ashok Kumar, ideologues of C.P.I M.L. followed suit and declared Sahajanand as unparallel mass leader and most relevant to coming peasant revolution. Shiv Sagar Sharma appreciated above evaluations of C.P.I. M.L. leaders and further added that:

1. Swamiji was foremost, outstanding super most freedom fighter, Peasant revolutionary and champion of war of Liberation which is incomplete still for which Naxals are striving and sacrificing.
2. He was democratic revolutionary and icon of freedom movement.
3. He was great national hero and left leader.
4. He was hero of toiling masses who were suffering from oppression, repression, exploitation.
5. He was unparallel, exceptional leader who was although product of history by creating upsurge reshaped the history and exposed illusion, mistakes of socialists and communists. He was unique vedanti leader who was engaged with people in his door to door campaign for peasant struggle.

EVALUATION OF SWAMI SAHAJANAND SARASWATI

Stratification is the basic organizational feature of societies. Differentiation in societies proceed stratification and then accompanies it. The surplus and reward of societies are distributed unequally and in consequence the inequality is instilled in the social structure and thus inequitous society comes into formation. In that context, according to law to every action there is equal and opposite reaction, the oppressed, suppressed, repressed, exploited class may find expression, which exactly happened when peasants of India as a product of historical necessity organized themselves under the above selfless leadership of Swami Sahajanand militantly, radically and gradually but continuously acquired strength day by day. The prevailing circumstances and condition of peasantry warranted the emergence of All India Kisan Sabha which was supported by honest intellectuals and all the left parties and eminent personalities which include Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose who believed wholeheartedly that peasants must be organized since it is in the country side that recruitment for the Indian Army takes place. To overthrow the British Empire it is essential to prepare the kisan for mass uprising which would in turn impell the Indian soldiers to rebell. Swami Sahajanand was in this context most important for Subhas. He was also an ideologue, formulator of dynamic socialism with his sound political instinct of radicalism, dynamism with clear cut conception of impending revolution (Forward, 20 April 1940,

Calcutta). Swami Sahajanand and Subhas Chandra Bose were complementary-supplementary to each other.

Swami Sahajanand Saraswati was in this land of ours a name to consure with, the undisputed, super most leader of organized peasant movement of India. He was idol of masses, icon of revolutionaries and national hero for crores. He was foremost leader of war of peasantry, war of independence and war of liberation of general working class which remained incomplete as India could not succeed in achieving total independence. He was an ideologue of revolution and propagator of United Left Front. His major contribution is, it was he, who had awaken the peasants. It was he, who had formulated the blue print of future revolution in his book "Krant Aur Sanyukta Morcha" and gave clear cut design of revolution as:

Fundamental change, total change, sudden change, abrupt change". By fundamental Change he meant change in ruling class, ruling system, existing social change not only change of Govt. person or ruling party. In this sence he was an ideologue of Indian revolution. He opposed Gandhi's ambiguity, vagueness on status of freedom and his devious pro-properties class attitude. He had opposed Congress Socialist Party's oscilation on issue of class struggle and ultimately switching over to Gandhates ditching Left Front. He opposed communist party of India on their role in division of India and its supporting attitude to British Raj in the garb of their "grow more food compaign. (Swamiji Presidential address at Bijaybada in 1944 and address at Mymansingh in 1945). He opposed communists on their stand on religion and mass culture. Swamiji was against superstition not against religion based on ethics whereas for communists religion was opium.

Swamiji's another contribution was he opposed Lenin's theory of dictatorship. He supported Marx's intent for mass organization, Association, Commune and Soviet. Swamiji was for composite leadership of labour, semi proletariats, peasant and petty bourgeoisie. He was against dictatorship of proletarian's theory (Kisan Sabha Ke Sansmaran, introduction 1947). In this way he theorized Marx in Indian context. He also interpreted Geeta Dharam as "Lok Sangrah" meaning "Service to Public". He reshaped inert Vedant and made it logical, active and pro people. He also reshaped Marx in Indian way and in Indian tradition. He bridged gap between Marx and Vedant.

His another unique contribution was that he fought not only for betterment of peasants but for capture of power to establish Kisan Mazdoor Raj. He was not orthodox Marxist. He was nearer to Marx no doubt, but he was Sanyasi of Adwait Vedantic Cult. For economic struggle he had seen relevance of Marx but for other considerations he had faith on Geeta. Sahajanand's another contribution is that he was among few who opposed vehemently when Gandhi pleaded for partition on 15-16 June 1947 in the meeting of All India Congress committee held at Delhi.

Sahajanand was the only leader who never compromised with any party, power or personality on his stand on peasant. He maintained at all times the singleness of purpose which had impelled him from the beginning and this was the resolution of peasant distress.

His last but not least contribution is in the sector of culture. It was due to impetus provided by his peasant struggles that Dinkar, Benipuri, Rahul, R.S. Sharma, Nagarjun, Agey, Machave, Mahasweta, Kuber Nath Roy, Biyogi, Ugra came on the stage of cultural revolution in north India in colonial period. Kisan movement led by him provided political cadres to all

parties such as Jayprakash, Narendra Deo, Namboodripad Karyanand Sharma, N.G. Ranga, Sohan Singh Bhakhana, Muzaffar Ahmad, Sheel Bhadra Yajee and others. Anti feudal struggles get extended and transformed in Anti imperialistic struggle ultimately. When sons of farmers who were in Army, Navy, Air Force and Police became rebellious then Atlee shifted the date of transfer of power to August 1947 instead of 1948 as per statement of Atlee in 1956 at Calcutta (V.M. Kulkarni: The Otherside).

Historic Naval Mutiny of 1940 proved to be the last nail in the coffins of British Empire. The impact of Subhas and his I.N.A Army and their influence had induced the Army to rebell and destroyed the edifice of Empire on which it was based. Britishers were compelled to leave at once in haste in 1947. Sahajanand did not allow the Kisan Movement to become a History. His legacy is still relevant. He had pleaded in favour of two fronts for Kisan uprising, One constitutional which will enable the strugglers in exposing the misdeeds and exploitation by ruling class. It will expose the inadequacy of Parliament in resolving the peasant's questions in their favour. The second Front is a class struggle. It should be the main strategy and it will be and it mostly nonviolent. Instead of party alliances he pleaded for class alliances. He discarded C.P.I. theory of national bourgeoisie, national front, national alliance and national leader. In his opinion the Indian bourgeoisie is collaborating bourgeoisie subservient to foreign capital. So, there cannot be national alliance under their national representative. In the interest of toiling masses. left consolidation is necessary. The Anti Compromise struggle against imperialism will be fought under the banner of left front and left leader Subash. This was not acceptable to C.P.I., C.S.P. and radical humanists leadership and, the left consolidation committee was disintegrated. This event became the defeat of Left Movement in India ultimately.

This was the paradox of freedom struggle. Swami Sahajanand in last phase of his life formed a united front constituting 18 small groups of left parties barring C.P.I., C.S.P. and radicals. He became President of United Socialist Organization of India on 21 February 1950. However his sudden demise on 26 June 1950 could not bring Kisan Mazdoor Raj in fruition. Walter Houser characterised Swami Sahajanand as "Ideologue Formulator and Activist of Kisan Sahbha". He is right.

Swami Sahajanand was leader of peasantry war of independence and war of Liberation of down trodden, exploited, oppressed toiling classes. He was unparalleled and unique in his vision, style and action. He was product of history and in turn created history. He could not receive his due from historians. Contrarily official historians gave birth to the myth of Gandhi being the last brave opponent of the partition. It was in truth, a tragedy that Gandhi's clever tactics mad partition. It was Gandhi who supported partition plan in meeting of all India congress committee held on 14-15 June 1947 at Delhi. It was Sahajanand who opposed him vehement ally in the meeting along with Tandon and others. Sahajanand-Subhash greatness lies not only in liberating India. From the yoke of imperialism but in taking along all the real anti imperialist forces with them. None of the constitutional leaders of India including Gandhi had that who emerged as small men on 15.8.1947. India suffered because C.P.I. and C.S.A. became trayee Sahajanand- Subhas leadership and joined Gandhi-Nehru Instead. World view of Gandhi and Sahajanand was fundamentally different. According to be "The Horrible 1919 Amritsar Massacre Mahatma Gandhi was British Secret Service Agent. It describes :

"In 1887, Mohandas Gandhi began his training as a British Secret Service in the capital of Empire London. His cover was barrister."

The British were determined to retain the in the crown at any cost and that necessitated Saturating India with British trained Spies.

"Lord Roberts of Kandahar recruited Gandhi for training as aspy. Aristocratic Admiral Edmond Slabde provided the finances to Gandhi's training in London. His daughter Madeline fell in love with Gandhi In June 1891, his spy training completed. Gandhi fought for the British during the brutal Boer war. In 1899 Lord Roberts commanded the British Army and Gandhi was part of a special balance After the British conquered South Africa the Zulus felt the iron heel of oppression. Sergeant Major Gandhi commanded an ambulance brigade during the uneven contest. Bangatha was killed in 1906. Miss Madeline (Mira) was Gandhi's live with British Secret Service. Gandhi went on several long rasts to keep the British in India in 1939 he forced S.C. Bose from presidency. He presided over the division of India in 1947.

As for the independence that came, it did not come as result of the congress struggle alone which was fought out by the revolutionary socialist group in 1942 it is to be remembered that Gandhites socialists did by Nehru and Jay Parkash Compromised with the Britishers during crucial period of 1943-45. According to Dhanjay Keer:

"The Congress leaders were ready now to fight for British imperialism against the Japanese aggression and even against Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose and his Indian National Army as openly declared by Pandit Nehru".

(Page 364, Veer Savarkar, Popular Publishing House, Bombay, 2012)

It is also an open secret now that Subhas a follower of Shivaji and his politics, had discussed the Indian and International politics during the second world war with Savarkar at Savarkar's home on 22 June, 1940, six months before his

dramatic disappearance from India in January 1941. In the course of the discussion Savarkar the Indian Mazzini, inspired Subhas, the Indian Garibaldi, for the idea of a liberation movement which would be organised outside the territories of India in order to intensify the struggle for Freedom. The born general in Subhas took the and played the role of the gudion Garibaldi rightly called the Netaji of the Indian National Army, Which as founded by Ras Bihari Bose in the east. Savarkar issued a statement after Bose's mysterious disappeared.

"Wherever he happens to be a have no doubt he will continue to contribute his all, even health and lise to the cause of Indian freedom." (Koer, p. 260)

The final victory was won when politics was carried into the Indian army when patriotisan took fire in the sank's of the Indian Armed Forces, when military Indian thus inspired with a great ideals rose in revolt under the Ras Behari Bose and Netaji Subhas Bose the British imperialiste considerably weascened by world war. I reahiseed that it was impossible to keep India in bondage any more for they had no faithful Army. The Army that was entrnside with the work had turned their guns towards their heads. The Prime Minister of Britain Atlee, Staked before the use of commons on March 15, 1946 on the occasion of making a declaration of the proposed transfer of to India, that the national idea had spread right through, not the least perhaps among some of the soldiers, who had done such wonderful service in the wera.

Mr. Fennner Brockway the political secretary of the Independent labour party of England. Gave three reasons for the transfer of power by Britian to India. He said that the :

- (a) Indian people were determined to achieve independence.
- (b) There was the revolt of the Royal Indian Navy and the Indian Foras could not be relived upon.

(c) Britian did not want to estrange India which was a market and a source of food stuffs for her

Note : When Atlee came to India around 1955 he told chakarnra the acting governor of Bengal that Subhas had made the Army and the revolt in the armed forces had forced then to the inevitable with draulal and evacuation from India and so of Ganhi-Nehru was Minimal (war of independence, Raghav Sharan Sharma, Manhor Publishing, New Delhi)

Gaggar Party and Savarkar were trying to carry the fire of patriotism in to the ranks of Indian Army ever since 1908-1917. At last the destined leader Netaji Subhas Bose Seized the opportunity and reaped the fruit of the Pionear efforts of Ras Baahari Bose and the military zation policy of Savarkar. His kery will record this vieneed in theis light Savarkars has the good. (Keerm p 184, as above.)

Source :

1. Gandhi, An autobiography, Beaconpress.
2. Herman Arthur, Gandhi and Churchi Bantam books. New Your 2004.
3. Mirben, the spirits pllgrimag great cean publishers. Brlingum virginia 1960.
4. Roberts, Fraderick sleigh. Forty years in India, R. Bently, London, 1997.
5. Singh G.B. Gandhi Behined the Mask of Divinity, Prometheus Books, Amherst, New York 2004.
6. Bose Sugata, His malisty's opponent, Subhas Chandra Bose and India's Struggle for independence, Harrard University Press Boston, 1957.
7. U tube @ 2014 Patrick Scrivener.
8. Timothy Watson Ph.D. Henry Makow. Can, As a free Moson employed by Gandhi's main role was to partition

India in order to set it up for future conflict.

9. Timothy Watson and col G.B. Singh. Gandhi under cross examination.
10. Tims website www.shakesaspear.com email, appollospear @ yahoo.com, the Myth of Indian independence.
11. Kathryn Tidirick, Gandhi, A political and Spiritual life.

SAHAJANAND: TODAY, TOMORROW AND BEYOND

Development of Indian philosophy and worldview has taken place via exchanges between Samkhya and Vedanta. Mahatma Buddha took Yoga from Indus Valley Civilization, revolt against ritual orthodoxy (like Yagna) from the evolving Upanishadic school of thought and materialism from Samkhya philosophy and blended them in a unique vision of ethical idealism of Indic essence. Therefore, Buddha represented the best projection of all that was beautiful, truthful and positive in tradition at that point of history. In this respect, Buddha was the biggest and tallest reformer of Indian civilization during that time.

Posterior to Buddha, many sects and cults emerged. All these sects had their distinct logic, practice and philosophical content. Schism emerged every now and then. This resulted in hardening of ritual orthodoxy. Various schools like Yogacara, Tantrayana, Theravada, Mahayana, Sthaviravada, Vajrayana, Lokayata, Vedantic sub-sects and others started having increased philosophical confrontations. In this era of intellectual upheaval and era of philosophical uncertainty, Adi Sankara, by virtue of his hardwork, analytical and logical abilities and organizational capacity expounded Advaita Vedanta.

In this philosophy, there was no distinction, whatsoever, between Ishwara (Godhead), Jeeva (Individual) and Prakriti (Nature). All of them are said to be concomitant and without any real boundary. This philosophy became the basis for his organization of Dashnami Sangathan. This organization gave

a new color and a new life to the almost dead and immobile 'Sangha' founded by Lord Buddha. Sankara's entire life was spent in active work, whether it was philosophical debates, writing scholarly and exegetical works or working as an organizer. This, which Lord Buddha also exhibited in his Dhammachakkapavattana, is the true hallmark of an ideal sanyasi - the life that was led by Adi Sankara, an existence that breathes new life in a stagnant society and an activism that becomes a pathfinder for the material and moral needs of the society. In essence, the Sanyasi, renunciate or the civilizational activist discharges the responsibility assigned by the material and motivating forces of contemporary society and history while such an individual by the sheer dint of labor, personal efforts and honest endeavour reshapes both the history and the motivating forces.

For example, the increasing usage of fire and iron led to facilitation of agriculture which transformed the nomadic society to agrarian society. This ensured continuous supply of revenue to the State, facilitating regular standing army in turn leading to empires of Bimbisara and Ashoka. These empires and the increased social mobility fed the cause of riverine trade and commerce subsequently leading to land trade and commerce upto Rome via Central Asia. The schematic of Lord Buddha's philosophy provided the framework for smooth transition, primordial national consciousness and rise of such empires. Just as without Protestants, industrial revolution could have failed to germinate, similarly without Lord Buddha's emphasis on preservation of cattle, social mobility, support for commerce as a dignified and religious way of livelihood et al furthered and bolstered the process. This is also reflected in his emphasis on logic, reason and rationalism. However, after 400 years again this society became rigid and lost mobility. This resulted in frequent successful domination of Indian frontiers by outside

invaders like Saka, Huna, Kushana etc led by leaders like Demetrius, Saka Amlat, Torman, Mihirkula etc. India remained tormented by them till 4th century AD. But Lord Buddha cannot be blamed for this subsequent degeneration and downfall into dark ages, while blame can surely fall on his later followers who aided rigidity and orthodoxy, thus destroying the essence of Buddha's message.

Similarly, we find that in the period influenced by Sankara, there is the rise of Pala and Gurjara Pratihara in north India, which protected the Eastern and Western frontiers respectively, while rise of Rashtrakuta empire gave a coherence to the region south of Narmada. In south India, Pallava and Chola arose which took Indic philosophies, civilization and empires to South and South East Asia. In the 12th Century AD, no region in the entire world had a robust and strong naval fleet that could have matched the naval power of Rajendra Chola. This led to opening of oceanic trade and commerce and further steeling of Indian nationhood. Sankara's work sustained society for the next 300 years whereby invaders topped at Western lands and growth and prosperity ensued in the mainland. It was Sankara who espoused the assimilative nature of Indian civilization by incorporating all foreign tribes into the Indian social orbit. Rise of Agnivanshis and Shakaldweepis can be attributed to him. Another stalwart Gorakhnath carried this assimilative process further to the most downtrodden and marginalized section. Again after nearly 300 years, the social structure became rigid and the symptoms of Beti-bandhi, Roti-bandhi, Hukka-bandhi, Samundra-bandhi and Jati-bandhi emerged. This resulted into a divided society which suffered shameful subjugation from the hands of new invaders in the name of Islam. The political debacle faced by this defeated society was evident in Battle of Tarain, Panipat, Khama, Haldighati etc.

Just as we cannot blame Buddha for the Dark Ages in

between Mauryan and Gupta periods, in the same manner we cannot blame Sankaracharya for further degeneration of Indian society which lured outside invaders after mere 300 years of his demise. The fault again lies with the later followers who had reduced and decelerated the tempo of the spirit induced by Buddha and Sankara.

In the later period, Tanrayana (and associated 5 Makaars), Kapalika, schism in Vedanta philosophy etc remerged and society was redrawn into turmoil leading to decadence and further subjugation to invaders. One section became over cautious and orthodox while other became overindulgent and libertarian leading to Khajuraho etc. The later of duo also led to further socio-moral decadance and obscene philosophical derogation by starting to search for mortal pleasure in religion and esoteric practices.

It was now that Vaishanava philosophy attempted to liberate Indian populace again by breaking free of barriers and reminding the ruling class of their duty to the public. This work was carried on by Ramanand, Tukaram, Namdev, Chokha Mela, Samarth Guru Ramdas, Tulsidas, Gyaneshwari, Nanak, Pran Nath etc which resulted into the arrival of political leaders such as Shivaji and Guru Gobind Singh. However this attempt was inadequate to extricate the populace and create a broader consciousness to fight oppression. It was also unfortunate immediately after this brief period arrival of European forces began which led to complete subjugation of Indian spirit to colonialism and imperialism - as if feudalism was not enough in itself.

The required gap of the incomplete work was filled up by militant and socially conscious leaders like Dayanand, Vivekanand and Arbind due to which a rekindling of nationalist subterranean wave took place. Vivekanand brought idealism next to materialism while expounding his interpretation of

Vedanta. Dayanand imparted the flavor of patriotism and social equality in the core of Indian society. These provided a fertile ground for next stop in Indian philosophy.

All the developments since Buddha and beyond took the final shape in form of Sahajanand in whom we find Sankara's Advaita, Buddha's rebellious spirit against orthodoxy, Vivekanand's bursting patriotism and Vaishanava, Nanak, Dayanand and Kabir's sharp edge of equality. Sahajanand went further and expanded the scope of equality further to economic and political spheres. Sahajanand not only represents the next stage of evolving Indian philosophy, he contains the fragrance of Indian nationhood, spiritualism and quest for liberation. We cannot imagine or have a Sahajanand without the historical lineage as mentioned above. Any attempt to represent Sahajanand in isolation would render him ineffective and immobile.

If we want to understand the exploitative nature of then prevalent agrarian system, we need to read Sahajanand. If we want to realize the utility of Indic theology in achieving material liberation or class struggle, we can hardly avoid reading Sahajanand. If we want to understand the role and status of peasants in any liberation movement, we need to read Sahajanand's treatise. Sahajanand elucidated the technique of defeating imperialism by fighting against feudalism as he did so. He provided young blood, progressive activists and new cadre to all parties during the freedom struggle.

His role in the yet-to-be-finished Indian Renaissance is unmatched. His agrarian movements gave birth to numerous field activists, journalists, writers, poets and intellectuals who went to chart out a new territory for themselves. He gave a new meaning to Vedanta by giving it the rigorous means of Marxian methods of class struggle which could become the vehicle of achievement of equality as desired by Vedanta in

this temporal and mortal world itself, Vedanta was earlier propagated mainly by belief and faith, Sahajanand added the flavor of logic and rationality of dialectics. Similarly, Marxian models were riddled and burdened with Weberian frameworks of impersonalism and pure rationality. Sahajanand liberated Marx by imparting strong humanist concerns, importance of individual initiatives and space for spiritualism in Marxism. This way while Marxism had the intellect, Sahajanand gave it a breathing heart. Similarly, Vedanta had become inert and a subject of mere preaching (Pravachan). Sahajanand activated its core and made Vedanta a servant of oppressed, exploited and marginalized. He was first monk who went to villages and hamlets enthusing people to take their future in their own hands, rather than leaving it to fate or circumstances.

In the political field, he stood by Subhas in his fight for complete independence as opposed to Gandhian demands of dominion status. He also took an adamant stand that the exit of British should lead to the transfer of power in hands of working class and peasants. He wanted representative of working class in the Constituent Assembly that unfortunately did not take place. He was also not in the favor of giving compensation of Zamindars and was for the seizure of British Capital. Accordingly, the independence achieved on 15th August 1947 was not in accordance to his dreams and vision. In Nehru's Ministry, people who got titles of 'Sir' were predominant who occupied important portfolios like Finance, Defence, Law and Commerce.

The importance of Sahajanand was due to his uncompromising, fearless and principled stand. The very society he was born into bode his greatest enemies - the propertied and the priestly class, though they till date unashamedly collect donation in his name for ulterior motives. Further, the political party, which he was dedicated to for most of his political career,

expelled him as he was speaking for poor farmers and peasants whose class interests were antagonistic to those of zamindars and maldars. Advaita Vedantis also ignore him till date as he tried to induce a Marxian flavor in his own Vedantic philosophy. They too don't like to listen to his name, let alone discuss. No one has even commented or even critiqued his treatise on Gita. The ideology of Marxism, which had a great impact on his later day political thinking, also refuses to accept him as one of its icons due to his fearless and uncompromising stand while a greater section of Communist elite was in favor of compromise with Nehru. They too have participated in a conspiracy of silence on his magnum opus "Kranti Aur Sanyukt Morcha". Therefore, no objective, comprehensive, realistic and correct analysis of his ideology, philosophy and formulation till date has come from any quarter. The credit to make him relevant or noticeable again goes to radical agrarian movements and scholars like Walter Hauser and Arvind N Das etc.

The discrepancy in attitude towards class struggle amidst Congress Socialists irked Swami Sahajanand Saraswati. While they were high on rhetoric, they had dismal or poor action line. They did not dare to cross the ideological limits set by Gandhiji. This increased antagonism between the two - resulting into parting of ways between Congress Socialists and Kisan Sabha in 1941. The failure of Subhas to correctly recognize the character of Japanese imperialism in light of Japan's atrocity in Nanking, Sanghai and other occupied areas resulted into a temporary separation between Swamiji and Forward Bloc. Communists also failed to identify the motivating force of contemporary colonial India. They did not write history with an objective view. However, this history could not have become pathfinder for future and was unable to impart any message. It just gave certain knowledge about events. British wanted that Pakistan may be created and the Pakistan movement was

instigated by imperialism. Jinnah, who was the leader of Zamindars and Maldars, became a mass leader by virtue of Communist support. Ultimate result of wrong policy of Communists was the partition of India. This unsettled Sahajanand and it caused a temporary break with Communists during 1945-47. The repression of Telangana movement brought them together in 1948. Ultimately Sahajanand was successful in bringing 18 parties on a common platform and on 21st February 1950 he was unanimously elected as the President of United Socialist Organization of India. It was on the line formulated by Sahajanand that the Governments of Kerala and West Bengal functioned initially.

When Gandhiji started supporting partition plan of Mountbatten on 15-16 Jan 1947 during AICC Conference held at Delhi, Sahajanand vehemently opposed Gandhiji along with Purushottam Das Tandon, Abdul Ghani, Latifur Rahman, Shivam Lal Saxena, Mohan Lal Gautam, Chouthi Ram Gidwani, Gopinath Bordoloi, Alagu Rai Shastri etc.

Sahajanand advised that struggle needs to be carried out concurrently on two different fronts - using both constitutional methods as well as extra constitutional methods. By extra-constitutional methods he meant class struggle waged daily and not the insane violence that occurred in the violent armed insurrections or caste based murders. Through constitutional means, he wanted to expose the ruling class from inside. At the same time, he wanted to use this to establish the limitation of the agency of constitutional methods for achieving the goals of liberation of the exploited class. Accordingly, for him the main form of struggle was to be supplemented by Constitutional methods. Communist Party ignored his tactical line.

The moot question today before us is what has to be done now to achieve the end of exploitation, the creation of an equitable society and to secure the dream dreamt by countless

martyrs of freedom struggle? Today we see that middle class has expanded rapidly and by ignoring this class, no movement is possible. In such a situation, the policy of a united broader alliance of all sections of society involved in the creation of wealth/productive work is necessary. The alliance has to stand for justice and fight against injustice of all sorts. MNREGA has increased antagonism between agricultural laborers and poor peasants. These two sections were mainstay of many Left parties. Their zeal for a structural change has been thus dampened by ever increasing antagonism. Accordingly, in any revolution middle class will form an important part. Long-term interest of semi-proletariat is in the entry of Capital in agriculture. However, the party structure of Communist Party opposes this for short-term gains. So they cannot move ahead and are trapped in a vicious cycle. The road can be opened again if such parties take a cue from Sahajanand.

We see that acrimony in society based on religion, caste and sectarian grounds in reaching ever-wider proportions. This too can be countered by strengthening the class conception as already suggested by Sahajanand. This concept has already been tested and practiced by legendary Birsa Munda in his anti imperialistic, anti feudal and anti-capital struggle. Subhas Chandra Bose too wanted the same. This itself cased Subhas's victory over Gandhiji's candidate in Triipuri in 1939. So only there thee - trinity of Birsa Munda, Subhas and Sahajanand - can be pathfinders and torch bearers for future struggle and development. In this stage those who merely appropriate resources and wealth should be defeated while those who are involved in productive and entrepreneurial work need to be enthused and promoted. Only then India can become self-reliant and a true world power.

73747



RAJA RAMMOHUN ROY
LIBRARY FOUNDATION

उपहार स्वरूप

Gifted by

राजा राममोहन राय पुस्तकालय प्रतिष्ठान

RAJA RAMMOHUN ROY
LIBRARY FOUNDATION

BLOCK DD-34, SECTOR-1 SALT LAKE
KOLKATA-700 064

Raghav Sharan Sharma (born January 12, 1942) is a veteran Indian dam engineer, writer, scholar and social activist. He retired as a chief superintending engineer of Hydel power project in the Koel-Kosi-Gandak region. He has been a passionate social activist, an avid adventure traveler and a prolific writer since last fifty years. He has the rare distinction of traveling the entire snow clad India-China trans-Himalayan border by foot. He is also the founder director of Swami Sahajananda Saraswati Shodh Sansthan, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh . He edited *India's War of Independence through Kisan Documents (3 Parts)* and *Swami Sahajanand Saraswati Rachnawali*.

ISBN 978-81-924841-7-4



9 788192 484174

₹ 800